THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

October 13, 1982

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: November 10, 1982 (Wednesday)
December 14, 1982 (Tuesday)

B. Approval of September 14, 1982 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

C. District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Decision No. 81-1304, report on citizens appeal of permit issuance for Georgetown Harbour Associates project 3020 K Street, N.W.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. CFA 13/OCT/82-2, Banneker Plaza, Portal Site, Parcels 47 & 49, Southwest, revised plaza design, 12th and D Streets, S.W.

b. CFA 13/OCT/82-3, Specialty Restaurant Corporation, revised preliminary design for new building, Deck Site C, Southwest Waterfront.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, October 13, 1982

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 82-115, 2715 M Street, N.W., renovation and new construction at the Corcoran School.

b. Appendix 1

3. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. SL 83-2, 1425 H Street, N.W., Southern Building, renovation and addition of two stories.

b. SL 83-1, 300 D Street, S.W., Sign.

c. Appendix 2

B. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/OCT/82-4, Fort Myer, Va., designs for a new Auto Service Station.

C. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

CFA 13/OCT/82-5, 1983 and 1984 Olympic coin designs.

o o o o o o o o o o o o o o
ADJOURN FOR LUNCH
o o o o o o o o o o o o o o

PM
12:30 RECONVENE at Cash Room, Treasury Department Building - 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

D. Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary

CFA 13/OCT/82-1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, design and location of additional name locator, sculpture and flagpole elements.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 82-108	3131 M Street, N.W. Greenbaum Bros. Joint Vent.	Conceptual designs for store renovation.

ACTION: No objection to concept of renovation to front facade and addition to rear of existing structure as shown on drawings (O.G. 82-108) received and dated 16 September 1982. Recommend restudy of store front display windows to reduce apparent size and scale of glazed areas and the addition of an awning to complement neighboring buildings. Recommend screening of proposed air-conditioning unit on roof from public alley at rear of structure. Request submission of detailed designs prior to issuance of permit.

O.G. 82-111	3319 O Street, N.W. Milorad Jevtich	New basement entrance and front door.

ACTION: Issue permit for the construction of a new basement entrance in present front wall of existing residence as shown on drawings (O.G. 82-111) received and dated 23 September 1982. Brick steps protected by an iron gate will provide access from the public sidewalk. The first floor entrance will be fitted with a new door duplicating the original but providing glass in the upper panels.

O.G. 82-112	3111-3119 M Street, N.W. Arthur Investment Co., Inc.	Conceptual design for renovation to existing commercial building.

ACTION: No objection to concept of renovating existing structure as three commercial spaces as shown in drawings (O.G. 82-112) received and dated 23 September 1982. Recommend greater visual separation of new commerical fronts from that portion of existing building to be retained. Recommend further study of details, particularly the use of brick as a decorative capping material.

O.G. 82-113 3327 O Street, N.W. Replace existing windows.
Mr. & Mrs. Hans Wyss

ACTION: Issue permit to replace existing windows of residential structure with double-hung thermopane wood sash having wood interior muntin bars as shown on drawing (O.G. 82-113) received and dated 4 October 1982.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 82-110	101 Constitution Ave., N.E. Reserve Officers Association	Incised sign.

ACTION: Issue permit for Reserve Officers Association sign as shown on drawings (S.L. 82-110) received and dated 24 September 1982. The 10" by 34'-0" sign will consist of letters incised into the existing limestone of the First (1st) Street facade.

S.L. 82-111	655 15th Street, N.W. Oliver T. Carr Company	Two (2) parking garage signs.

ACTION: Issue permit for two (2), 1'-1 1/2" by 11'-6", bronze anodized parking signs with white lettering to be placed in transom panels of garage openings to new office structure on G Street as shown on drawings (S.L. 82-111) received and dated 4 October 1982.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

13 October 1982

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members Present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Harold Burson Hon. John S. Chase Hon. Sondra G. Myers Hon. Walter A. Netsch Hon. Alan R. Novak Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Staff Present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Miss Paulie Sturtevant
National Capital Planning Commission Staff Present:	Mr. George Oberlander Mr. George Evans
D. C. Historic Preservation Office Staff Present:	Ms. Suzanne Ganschinetz

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 10 November 1982 (Wednesday)
14 December 1982 (Tuesday)

B. Minutes of 14 September 1982 meeting, approved.

C. District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Decision No. 81-1304, report on citizens' appeal of permit issuance for Georgetown Harbour Associates project at 3020 K Street, N. W. The Secretary reported that on 1 October the court had ruled in favor of the hearing officer's decision in this case, thus opening the way to the issuance of a building permit.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Redevelopment Land Agency

a. CFA 13/OCT/82-2, Banneker Plaza, Portal Site, Parcels 47 & 49, Southwest, revised plaza design, 12th and D Streets, S. W. The Assistant Secretary recalled the original and two subsequent submissions of this project and then introduced Larry Press from the D. C. Government. Mr. Press noted that the size and shape of the central plaza had been the area of most concern. At the July meeting of the Commission a plaza placed on the Maryland Avenue diagonal had been submitted, on the recommendation of RLA, and was not approved, the members expressing their preference for the previous rectangular shape. He said the D. C. Government and the architect would now present further designs based on two different options.

Vlastimil Koubek, the architect, was then introduced. He noted initially that the location of entrances to the parking garage had been changed, and because of fire regulations, a vehicular entrance from Twelfth Street had been added. He also pointed out a change in the curved shape of the hotel, as recommended by RLA. Turning to the plaza designs, Mr. Koubek said he had done two variations on a circular motif and two on the rectangular shape. One rectangular design showed a hard-edged, paved plaza; the other was a softened rectangle, almost an oval, and incorporated more planting than the other. The two circular plazas varied in size, one being very large and extending into the building area. All schemes showed a pool and fountain in the center of the plaza, and a tree-lined diagonal road leading to Twelfth Street. The members preferred the softened rectangular scheme because of its generous planting and ease of vehicular access to the surrounding buildings. The road in this scheme was also preferred because it was narrower and planted heavily on both sides while still retaining a good view of the Capitol dome. This was labeled "Scheme B" and was unanimously approved. The revised shape of the hotel was also approved. Exhibit A

b. CFA 13/OCT/82-3, Speciality Restaurant Corporation, revised preliminary design for new building, Deck Site C, Southwest Waterfront. The Assistant Secretary introduced Alan Hanson, architect, from the Kerns Group. He showed revised schematic drawings and a model,

representing further development of the turn-of-the-century boathouse design he had presented at the July meeting. He pointed out an improved relationship between his and the adjoining building, achieved through picking up horizontal fascia and soffit lines. There had been some simplification of outline, as recommended by the Commission, and the colors had been changed to bring them closer to those of the existing waterfront structures. The basic color would be tan, lighter than that on the adjoining building (Casa Maria Restaurant), with a deep green roof, rather than the bronze seen elsewhere. Mr. Netsch asked about the use of the open space on the other side of the proposed new building; he was told that it was a public park. Mr. Stone asked about the structural system; Mr. Hanson replied that it would be a steel frame with concrete floors. Brick would be used for the walls and the roof would be metal. There were no further questions and the preliminary design was unanimously approved. Exhibit B

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 82-115, 2715 M Street, N. W., renovation and new construction at the Corcoran School. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for the renovation of the old Corcoran School building and the addition of new structures on the property. The school building would be used for offices for the Hotel Workers' Union, and the new buildings would be residential, or a mix of residential and office space. He said the Georgetown Board had approved the conceptual design, but asked for additional scale study of the M Street facades.

Architect Arthur Cotton Moore was introduced to discuss the design. He noted the use of towers at both the eastern and western "gateways" to Georgetown and said he had also incroporated them in his project, both to act as a "marker" at the entrance to Georgetown, and also to signal the change to a smaller scale as one leaves the large scale West End development. He said the school building would be restored, five new townhouses built towards Rock Creek Park, and a large office and residential building erected on M Street. The members were pleased with the overall concept, but Mr. Netsch agreed with the Georgetown Board's concern about the scale, feeling that the heavy, three-story Richardsonian arches used on the M Street building were too monumental, especially if the idea was to show the reduction in scale from the West End to Georgetown. He thought it would be better to reflect the character of the school facade. The conceptual design was approved, with the Georgetown Board to see further facade studies.

b. Appendix 1, approved.

3. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 83-2, 1425 H Street, N. W., Southern Building, renovation and addition of two stories. The Assistant Secretary noted

that the Southern Building had been designed by Daniel Burnham, the Commission's first chairman, in 1910, and that it was one of the more distinguished buildings in the Fifteenth Street Historic District. He introduced architect Shalom Baranes to discuss the proposed addition. Mr. Baranes showed a number of slides of the building, including views of the roof and details of the terra cotta trim and cornice. He said he had worked with Burnham's successor firm in Chicago (Graham, Anderson, Probst and White) and had reviewed the original drawings for the steel work. These indicated that the building was to have been eleven stories high originally but had been cut back to nine. He showed slides of column stubs projecting above the roof and noted the unusually high penthouse, additional proof that more stories were intended. Also, testimony at a Congressional investigation of an insurance company involved in the construction had further substantiated the additional height intention. Mr. Baranes theorized that as inspection showed that the steel work in the cornice was intended to be permanent, the plan must have been to put the additional floors behind it, as had been done by Burnham in several other buildings. He showed slides of these, saying he had used them as the basis for his design of the Southern Building addition. He said casts would be made of various decorative elements on the building so that these elements could be repeated on the addition. In answer to a question from Mr. Netsch, he said the new ornament would not be terra cotta, but rather a glazed cast stone which had proven to be satisfactory. He noted finally that the additional height would not be noticeable because other buildings in the area were already at the height proposed. He said sight line studies had shown that the addition would be just barely visible at a distance of about 20 feet. Mr. Baranes showed drawings of his design for the addition, with various window treatments for the top floor. The members did not like the one with square windows, feeling they were too large and out of character with the period of the building; it was suggested that he refine one of the rectangular window schemes. In closing, Mr. Baranes said other work in the building would include central air conditioning, a new fire stair, a connection to the McPherson Square Metro station, and cleaning and repair of the brick and terra cotta exterior. The members commended Mr. Baranes on his presentation and approved the addition and renovation unanimously, with the window recommendation noted above.

b. S.L. 83-1, 300 D Street, S. W., sign. The Assistant Secretary described this sign as being made up of 3 foot high letters internally illuminated by neon tubing. It would be placed in the cornice of the building. Architect David Condon, of Keyes, Condon and Florance, was introduced. He said the purpose of the sign was to identify the building from the Southwest Freeway, and the large letters were necessary so that the sign could be read from that distance. The letters would be outlined in dark green to pick up the color used on the building. He said it could be backlighted sign if there were objections to the neon tubing. The members all felt that a sign of this

size, high up on the building, would be very visible and set a dangerous precedent. On that basis, not on its design, the sign was unanimously disapproved.

c. Appendix 2, approved.

B. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/OCT/82-4, Fort Myer, Virginia, designs for a new auto service station. The Assistant Secretary informed the members that there was an existing service station close to Washington Boulevard that would be dismantled and replaced by a new one within the fort. He introduced Mr. Geyer, an engineer with the Army, to discuss this replacement. Mr. Geyer turned the discussion over to Jack Webb, the planner involved with the project. Mr. Webb showed drawings of a station built into earth mounds and otherwise screened to make it as inconspicuous as possible. There would also be a small Post Exchange attached to the station. The members liked the design and the screening efforts and approved the project unanimously. Exhibit C

C. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

CFA 13/OCT/82-5, 1983 and 1984 Olympic coin designs. Staff member Sue Kohler told the members that the Mint would issue three coins to commemorate the 1984 Summer Olympics in Los Angeles: a one dollar silver coin to be issued in 1983; and a one dollar silver coin and ten dollar gold coin to be issued in 1984. She introduced George Schafer from the Mint to discuss the designs.

Mr. Schafer showed the members preliminary sketches of the obverse and reverse of each coin, noting that these designs would be released to the public the following day at a press conference. In general, the members were not pleased with the designs and unanimously diaapproved them, with two exceptions: the eagle on the reverse of the 1984 one dollar coin was approved, as was the Great Seal on the reverse of the 1984 ten dollar coin. The designs of the other faces were considered weak, overly complicated or confusing. Specific comments were relayed to the Mint in a letter. It was also noted that the lettering was very poor in all the sketches, making it impossible to tell what style was intended. Both the Chairman and Mr. Netsch emphasized to Mr. Schafer the importance of submitting such designs well in advance of any press conferences, so that suggestions could be made and revisions completed before designs were released to the public. The other members agreed and noted that a similar situation had occurred with the George Washington commemorative coin. Exhibit D

****

The members adjourned for lunch at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 12:30 p.m. in the Cash Room of the Treasury Department to review the last submission on the agenda.

****

D. Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary

CFA 13/OCT/82-1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, design and location of additional name locator, sculpture and flagpole elements. The Chairman reviewed the Commission's previous approval of the winning competition design and said it would now hear testimony relevant to the addition of several elements to that design.

The first group of speakers were those directly involved with this submission and included Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund representatives John Wheeler, James Webb and Jan Scruggs; architect Kent Cooper, landscape architect Joseph Brown, and sculptor Frederick Hart. The VVMF representatives outlined the history of the decision to request the additions and testified as to why they felt they were desirable and appropriate; those associated directly with the design discussed the elements themselves and their proposed location.

The next group of speakers testified in favor of the additions, feeling that they would bring an added dimension to the memorial and would honor the living as well as the dead. This group included Assistant Secretary of the Interior Donald Hodel, Congressman Don Bailey, representatives from veterans groups, and individuals speaking for themselves. The last group spoke against the additions, saying they would destroy the integrity of the design and were not necessary. Speakers included Maya Lin, designer of the memorial, Robert Lawrence, president and fellow of the AIA, and Paul Spreiregen, FAIA, who had organized the competition. (A list of those who testified is appended to these minutes as Exhibit E .)

After approximately four hours all testimony had been heard, and the members left to visit the site. Upon their return, the Chairman reconvened the meeting. Then he made a statement in which he summarized the Commission's role as mandated by Congress, its review of the original design and suggestions made to overcome practical problems, and most recently, the statement in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, that the Commission thought it would be possible to add other elements to the design in such a way as to receive its approval. He said the specific elements--a name locator, flag, and sculpture representing three Vietnam soldiers--had now been proposed, and the members had had a chance to review them, hear testimony, and visit the site. Their conclusions, he said, were as follows:

1. There should be more than one name locator; its design should be more dignified than the one proposed; and its location should not be on axis with the arm of the memorial, as proposed, because in that way it appears to be part of the design. He said that on visiting the site, the members felt that a location to the west, near the Southwestern entrance to the site, on the side of the Lincoln Memorial, from which most visitors will approach, would be most suitable and convenient to the handicapped.

2. A flagpole, approximately 50 feet in height, bearing an inscription at its base, would be totally appropriate to this memorial. He commented, however, that it would set a dangerous precedent and the Commission would look very hard at any suggestions for a proliferation of flagpoles on the Mall. He noted that there was already a ring of flags around the Washington Monument, the focus for the whole Mall composition. The location of this flagpole should also be near the entrance to the site.

3. The sculpture was considered competent, moving and appropriate. The Chairman said, however, that the maquette presented was very small, and final approval would have to be reserved until the final maquette was seen. Like the other two additions, its location was questioned. Set roughly in the middle of the site, it seemed episodic and had no relation to the flag, placed far away behind the wall of the memorial.

As they looked at the site, the Chairman said, it seemed to the members that the three elements should be placed in proximity to each other up front, near the southwest entrance to the memorial site. Here they would be more meaningful, have greater impact, and at the same time not disturb the original design.

When the Chairman had finished speaking, Mr. Netsch moved that his statement be accepted as that of the Commission. Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved. Therefore, the addition of name locators, flag and sculpture were approved; their locations were not approved; nor was the design of the name locator.

The Chairman said the Commission would work with those involved to bring about a resolution as quickly as possible. He noted that the next Commission meeting was scheduled for 10 November, but that it might be possible to work out a solution and come to an agreement before that date. (A complete transcript of this portion of the meeting is appended as Exhibit E-1) Exhibit E-2

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT A

October 27, 1982

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Commission met with Mr. Press of your office on October 13, 1982 and approved revisions shown on scheme B for the plaza designs for the Banneker Plaza project. Since this scheme fully accommodates the previous recommendations of this Commission and at the same time has the concurrence of your Department, the Commission looks forward to reviewing the detailed building, landscape and plaza designs as they develop.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert L. Moore, Director
District of Columbia Department of
Housing and Community Development
1133 North Capitol Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT B

October 27, 1982

Dear Mr. Moore:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. Press of your office on October 13, 1982 and approved revised designs for the Specialty Restaurant project on the Southwest Waterfront, Deck Site C. In giving its approval the Commission is reacting to preliminary massing and general architectural studies only and reserves judgement on the proposed materials and colors until review of the final design drawings. Though the proposal involves a decided departure from some of the other recent construction on the waterfront, its fresh boathouse character should be a welcome addition to the area.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Robert L. Moore, Director
District of Columbia Department of
Housing and Community Development
1133 North Capitol Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT C

October 27, 1982

Dear Mr. McCormick:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. Geyer and Mr. Webb of the Engineering Division on October 13, 1982 and approved designs for the new automobile Service Center at Fort Myer, Virginia. Our approval is contingent on the brick color matching adjacent structures and the landscape being implemented as part of the project. The fencing, berming and landscaping of this project should provide suitable screening of the usual clutter of service stations, and in our view will help it blend into the Post in a harmonious way.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick
Chief, Engineering Division
Military Programs
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D. C. 20314

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT D

October 27, 1982

Dear Mr. Frere:

At its meeting on 13 October 1982 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed preliminary designs for three coins commemorating the 1984 Summer Olympics. The designs for these coins were not approved, with the exceptions noted below. The specific comments were as follows:

1. 1983 One Dollar Coin, obverse: Triple image discus thrower motif is acceptable, but question whether relief of main figure is strong enough to differentiate it from the other two. Placement of figure also needs further study. Reverse: design of eagle is weak, especially portrayal of shoulder area.

2. 1984 Ten Dollar Coin, obverse: Design with figures superimposed on Olympic symbol is too complicated, and the feet of the figures seem to be tripping on the numbers of the date. The possibility of using the handsome Olympic symbol alone could be considered. Reverse: approved.

3. 1984 One Dollar Coin, obverse: Design is confusing, making Coliseum appear to be wings attached to sculpture in front of it. Suggest eliminating Coliseum, or sculpture, or using different design. Reverse: approved.

An additional comment, applying to all the sketches, was that the lettering was very poor, making it impossible to tell what style was intended.

Once again the Commission would like to request that designs for coins and medals be submitted well in advance of any press conferences. Only in this way can our review be constructive and allow for revisions to be completed before the designs are released

to the public. We note that we first saw these coins on 13 October and the press conference was scheduled for the following day. A similar situation occurred with the George Washington commemorative coin.

The Commission will be happy to review revised designs at its meetings on 10 November or 14 December 1982. We suggest that the submission of clay maquettes would be helpful.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Francis B. Frere
Assistant Director of the Mint for Marketing
Bureau of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D. C. 20220

Commission of Fine Arts Meeting
13 October 1982
Witness List
Vietnam Veterans Memorial

EXHIBIT E

LEAD OFF SPEAKERS

1. John P. Wheeler, chairman of the board, Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund
2. James Webb, VVMF
3. Frederick Hart, sculptor
4. Kent Cooper, architect
5. Joseph Brown, landscape architect
6. Jan Scruggs, president, VVMF

FOR ADDITIONS

1. Hon. Donald Hodel, Assistant Secretary of the Interior
2. Hon. Donald Bailey, Member, U. S. House of Representatives
3. Cooper T. Holt, director of the Washington office, VFW
4. Joseph E. Miller, assistant legislative director, American Legion
5. Morgan S. Ruph, Amvets
6. Admiral Mark Hill, Naval Aviation Association
7. Major General J. Milnor Roberts, executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the U. S.
8. Regina Wilk, past president, Gold Star Mothers
9. Frank McCarthy, Vietnam Veterans Relief Foundation, president
10. Andy Messing, Vietnam Veteran in the Constitutional Caucus
11. David DeChant, Vietnam veteran
12. Michael Milne, director, Veterans of the Vietnam War, Inc.
13. R. Jack Powell, executive director, Paralyzed Veterans of America
14. Richard J. Gallant, service director, Military Order of the Purple Heart
15. Donald J. Swartz, director of veterans' affairs, Veterans of the Vietnam War
16. Brigadier General George B. Price (retired), The Rocks
17. Patricia C. Hughes, editor and publisher, Stars and Stripes
18. Thomas Pauken, Vietnam veteran
19. Rick Abell, Peace Corps
20. Milt Copulos, Vietnam veteran
21. Thomas Carhart, Vietnam veteran
22. Michael S. Davison, VVMF
23. Scott C. Brewer, Vietnam veteran
24. Edward Lyle, Vietnam veteran
25. John T. Williams, Vietnam veteran
26. Mary Louise Dowling, volunteer for VVMF
27. Michael Detmold, Vietnam Veterans Agent Orange Victims, Inc.
28. Al Santoli, author
29. Richard F. Weidman, Vietnam Veterans of America

AGAINST ADDITIONS

1. Maya Ying Lin, designer of the memorial
2. Robert Lawrence, president, American Institute of Architects
3. Paul Spreiregen, professional adviser for the memorial competition
4. Henry F. Arnold, landscape architect, designer of Constitution Gardens
5. Wolf Von Eckardt, writer
6. Michael Straight, former deputy chairman, NEA
7. Jim Brodniak, Vietnam Veterans Against the War
8. Janice Connally, private citizen
9. James J. Butera, Vietnam veteran
10. Peggy Robin, Landmarks Committee, ANC-3c

AFTERNOON SESSION

(12:37 p.m.)

(Reconvened at Cash Room, Treasury Department Building, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The meeting will come to order. We are reconvening the stated mission of the Commission of Fine Arts, the first part of which took place in the Fine Arts Commission headquarters across from the White House on Jackson Place, and we have completed our agenda now except for one outstanding item, consideration of some new proposals for additions to the design of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which was approved by this Commission at various meetings heretofore.

We will start off with the proponents of these design changes, and I understand that John Wheeler, President of the Board of Vietnam Veterans Fund, would like to be the first speaker.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, good afternoon. I am John Wheeler, Chairman of the Board of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

"Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose, but young men think it is, and we were young."

When I saw the statue which we are presenting to you,

I thought of that

, INC.
nue, N.E.

A. E. Housman wrote them.

We Vietnam veterans were young men together in the cauldron of war.

There were bonds born in our military service that are never broken. I think that they are not even broken by death. They are bonds of friendship and creativity. We have worked together to create this statue as part of a beautiful national memorial.

It takes courage to grieve, and our country has only begun the process of grief after the Vietnam War.

Grieving is work. Grief means looking at the truth and brings a time of anger at the loss, and the anger takes different forms for each person. The hardest part of the job of building Vietnam Veterans Memorial is to face the anger involved as our country does this work.

This statue is part of the beginning of the process. I think the statue is a hopeful sign that our country in time can work together more creatively and in greater friendship after the Vietnam War.

As you consider the statue and hear the men who have made it possible, please see if your own thoughts are as hopeful as mine.

The statue, flag and placement we present to you

INC.
ue, N.E.

today are the wholehearted recommendation of myself and the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

We make the recommendation for two reasons:

First, the statue and flag gracefully honor living Vietnam veterans, by incorporating a tangible human presence.

Second, the recommended placement makes an integrated unity of the whole Memorial.

May I ask, if possible, that a decision be made today so that our work can go forward.

By your approval today, the Fine Arts Commission can take a major step for the whole Nation in healing the wounds of the Vietnam War and honoring the Vietnam veteran.

With your permission, our order of presentation this afternoon is in four parts. First, James Webb, who has served as a member and spokesman of the Sculpture Panel of the Memorial Fund, will speak to the guidelines which were used, which were used in developing the sculpture.

Second, Rick Hart, the sculptor, will speak about his creation.

Third, architect and landscape architect, Kent Cooper and Joe Brown, will discuss sitings of the sculpture and the mast for the flag.

Finally, Jan Scruggs, President of the Memorial

INC.
ue, N.E.

Fund, will close.

I, sir, I thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. WHEELER: May I introduce James Webb.

MR. WEBB: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, I would first like to introduce the members of the Sculpture Panel other than myself who participated with me in this creative process. First, Milt Copulos, who is an energy expert with the Heritage Foundation. He has his own syndicated energy column. He was a two-tour Vietnam veteran. I understand that Milt will also testify in his individual capacity later today.

Second, Ray James, who is the associate sculptor. He was an enlisted Marine, rifleman, during the siege of Tsisungh (phonetic). Thirdly, Art Mosely who holds a degree from West Point and one from Harvard, who is in the construction business. He has 10 years of extensive design experience, both here and in Miami, Florida. Art.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this memorial is not to remember the Vietnam War dead. It is not meant to be a memorial specifically to the Vietnam War dead; it is intended to honor and recognize all those who served in Vietnam.

I became involved with this project at its

.. INC.
nue, N.E.

inception. I was an initial member of the sponsoring committee, I was before the House Veterans Committee when this legislation was working its way through the Congress. In that capacity, I drafted the speeches, press releases, dear colleague letters and, most importantly, I gave my personal guarantee to dozens of Members of Congress as to what this memorial would do to the position of the Vietnam veterans. This all was wrapped up through hearings and everything else into what is called Congressional intent.

Thirdly, my novel, which is a combat novel, was supposedly mandatory reading for the jury in the design competition and was recommended reading for all of the competitors.

When the initial design was announced, I immediately contacted the Memorial Fund and discussed with them and began a process which, unfortunately over a period of four months, led to my resigning from the National Sponsoring Committee in order to disassociate myself from the project which I believe was incomplete. I testified in writing before this Commission last year when Mr. Tom ~~Star~~ Carhart testified orally, outlining some of my recommendations, and I am pleased today to be here as a spokesman for the compromise that has been reached through a very long process ~~in~~ which will be outlined in greater detail to you by our representatives from the architectural community.

., INC.
nue, N.E.

The issue as I foresee it is one between a design solution, which is imminently compatible with the site, which it was supposed to go, but at the same time it was not a statement of honor to the constituent group, the Vietnam veterans.

I think there are clear indications that this is a correct assessment. This is not, as has been indicated in some press accounts, a few individuals who have created havoc with the process. The two clearly demonstrable indications of this are, first of all, the Gallup Poll of the prisoners of war, in which 67 percent of our former Vietnam prisoners stated that they disliked the wall; 70 percent stated that they wanted the walls to be white; 82 percent stated that they should be above ground; 96 percent stated that the flag should be in a prominent place; and only 18 percent believe that the initial design would appeal to those who fought.

Secondly, the entire Ohio delegation of Vietnam Veterans of America, which is 3,000 members, overwhelmingly rejected the initial design as something that did not bring them honor.

Again this is a clear indication that something needed to be done, and we are very pleased with what we have come up with. We believe that we have placed the initial

design into a context that will allow all those who served in Vietnam to feel that they are honored when they visit the site. We began with the mandate from the compromise meetings and working off of that mandate, we believe we have done two things. First of all, we have honored the principals involved in the compromise but, at the same time, we have, through a series of meetings of four individuals who had completely divergent viewpoints on what the memorial meant to them, actually enhanced the original design while, at the same time, showing the utmost respect for it. Our original mandate, as you might recall, was to place a sculpture, essentially a sculpture of the traditional Army infantry pose, leading individuals into the attack, directly in front of the juncture of the two walls. The American flag would be on top of the walls actually in the juncture. That was where we began.

We now have a solution after many months and many trips to the site which will incorporate three figures, three eight-foot figures, 170 feet away from the wall in the most appropriate place on that site where they will blend with the site and in a state of artistic tension with the existing design but in no way infringing on it.

The flag has been moved to a place 40 feet away from the juncture of the walls in its own area where it can

.. INC.
que, N.E.

be visited but, at the same time, in a way that is integral to the design. I believe this does two things. For those who have supported the concept of a wall design as a memorial, it does not intrude on their ability to appreciate that design. It creates figures 170 feet away from a 400-foot wall, hardly overwhelming. For those who were unsatisfied with the original design, we believe that it has done a very important thing; that is, it has placed their design into an artistic concept. My view of this is it tells a story. You have three individuals, two white and one black, who are bounded by their war experience. They are strong individuals and, at the same time, they are young and they are sensitive. Purity across this gash in the earth, which represents the tragedy of Vietnam to the American flag which represents the reasons for military service. In that way, you have the unified one single memorial concept. And, in a way, that does not interfere with the original design.

We chose Frederick Hart as a sculptor for this project for a number of reasons. First, he was the highest placing sculptor in the original design competition and, as a result, we believe we have done justice to the original design competition.

Secondly, and most importantly, he is a nationally

D., INC.

renowned sculptor, he has demonstrated his buildings. We interviewed him extensively before we contracted with him. There has been some report that this is a sculpture that was designed by a committee. I can tell you emphatically that that is not true and anyone who knows Rick Hart's credentials will know that on its face. This is his design. We are simply amazed by it.

And with that, I will introduce Mr. Frederick Hart.

MR. HART: I have some historical -- a conceived list with three things in mind. First, to preserve the simplicity and austerity of the design.

Second, to create a work which interacts with the wall to form a unified totality.

And, finally, to create a sculpture which is in itself a moving experience of the Vietnam veteran.

I have attempted to do this by means of understatement. The sculpture is removed from the area of the wall; it does not intrude or obstruct compared to the scale of wall; that is, the sculpture is quite small. It does not attempt to compete or to dominate. The figures are turned to the wall to create an image in metaphor. The tension between the elements echoes from one to the other. The figures are treated in a realistic manner. They are close to life size

and they stand on a low base which is incorporated into the landscape. One senses the figures as passing by the tree line and caught by the presence of the gaze upon it almost as a vision. The portrayal of the figures is consistent with history. They wear the uniform and carry the equipment of the war. They are young. The contrast between the innocence of their youth and the weapons of wars underscores the poignancy of their sacrifice. This is developed in the contrast and sense of unity that speaks of the bounds of love and sacrifice that is the nature of man and war. Yet, they are each alone. Their strength and their vulnerability are both evident.

I see the wall as the kind of ocean, a sea of sacrifice that is overwhelming and nearly incomprehensible in its streak of names. I place these figures upon the shore of that sea, gazing upon it, standing in visual before it, reflecting the human face of it, the human art.

Thank you.

Mr. Kent Cooper and Mr. Joseph Brown.

MR. COOPER: My name is Kent Cooper. We have appeared before you on prior occasions as project architects for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

In March 1982, when you concurred with Secretary

Watt's request that was forwarded through VVMF that a flag and statue be ~~co~~located on the site, the task fell to us to work with the designated parties, the Sculptor Selection Committee and our own consultants, to ensure a proper location of these added symbolic elements be found, without damaging the basic memorial design.

Our task has been an unusually difficult one, for many individuals who have been involved in this project feel that aesthetics can be separated from such MESSAGE issues as "appropriate patriotic content" and "political message." We have taken a consistent stand that aesthetics in itself is an important component message and cannot be separated out. So, therefore, in approaching these changes, we have therefore designed to ensure that the basic nonpolitical message of the memorial is preserved and the inherent aesthetic attributes of the basic concept are preserved.

In this process, we have been served well by the fact that Miss Lin's concept is grand enough to overcome any but the most blatant intrusion.

Frederick Hart's concept, three close to life-size realistic figures placed carefully along the perimeter tree line facing the walls, seems to us to be an acceptable resolution that is placed before us.

CO., INC.

Joe Brown from EDAW who has been landscape consultant to the Sculpture Committee, will explain the process by which the location for the sculpture was determined.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be at your usual low key roll up your sleeves meeting here.

I need to use the model and I need to use some boards so I am going to have to leave the podium.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Please feel free.

MR. BROWN: I would like to start with this analysis plan and then we will place the sculpture and the flag on the model.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If there are people who would like to hear this, is one of the microphones detachable perhaps?

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

There are several natures at work here and, as Kent said, we have all worked together to try to deal with all of these.

He must have liked the first line (indicating microphone).

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Some of the microphone work, too.

MR. BROWN: This is in the nature of the site and way back several years ago, we were hired by the Fund to

select a site, and we did that. There is the nature of the wall, very implicitly involved with the site at this point, and there is the nature of the sculpture which I believe Rick has eloquently described. The sculpture was underway as the site selection process began. An important aspect of the nature of the site and the wall is the vertex and that is the crucial design aspect and the angles that come from that and the great change that comes from that.

With that in mind, we began -- and this drawing tries to sum up, and I hope you can all see it, tries to sum up the issues that we went through. From the very beginning, we were fascinated with the tree line because it, other than the wall, is a major feature of this site. The trees present a kind of growth and living opportunity to work with lights, filtered lights, shade and shadow. The approach that you can have through the trees to the site, as well as the approach from various angles of the wall along the trees. We like the spacial edge of the trees and we like the fact that the tree line was sufficiently distant from the wall that we felt the immediate area of the wall would not be violated in any way. The wall could be experienced acceptably.

We like the fact that the tree line and just outside the tree line presented a plateau that was not

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

integrated into the slope so you were off the slope. We liked the way the sweep of the slope suggested an area for inner activity in several ways. First, a closeup, the sculpture could be interactive with the trees in a literal way, the lights, the position and the approach. In a distant activity much as Rick has talked about, the relationship of the sculpture and the wall in a distant way could have an inner active quality. So we began focusing in on this area.

We immediately eliminated before that several other areas. Certainly nothing could go here and block that angle and view to the Washington Monument because, as we all know, the wall creates this beautifully simple directional connection a mile down the Mall. It does the similar thing in this direction. So those areas had to be avoided.

Obviously, we felt the vertex had to be avoided. We then began to try to draw a zone. We had a lot of people involved and we wanted to meet a diverse sense of values for this memorial in siting the sculpture.

We initially, in working with the tree line, came on this area right here. This is red maples that was planted around the Constitutional Gardens renovation. We like the quality of that, almost architectural, and there were several options. There were two locations thought of initially in

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

this zone, one at 150 feet and one at 170. It provided certain opportunities as you approached from really the basic entry direction. We have said we defer to this as the entry direction mostly because it is probably closer to a greater number of parking spaces. The information pylon is also sited here. There is opportunity for access here as well and through the trees as well. You can see we have diagrammed what those access areas are through the trees. So the views along the tree line from this direction along the tree line to this direction, we like that area.

We then went to the site several times. We placed some models in real scale on the site, and we are all prepared to do that with you today at your leisure. And we felt that this tree edge was getting too tight when you projected the growth of these trees, and that is what we have done. We have projected the growth of the red maples to maturity to be realistic and factual. Then we found another area which was a little bit more open, a pass-through space, and as you walk the site a great deal, you find this major path through the trees, and we liked that approach area. This really appeared to be a more minor path through the trees. So we selected this area, this is 180 feet from the vertex, and this is give or take five feet.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: One hundred seventy?

MR. BROWN: It is really 180, and the back of this square is 185, but that is for your consideration.

We projected the growth of the liquid ambers which grow a little bit bigger than the red maples, and you can see when you go to the site, and that is important to go to the site, the nature of how this fits in the opening of these trees. It has some space around it for its own character and this is 180-foot distance from the wall. Usually at your meetings we put these drawings at your table. We won't do it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You are welcome to do it. We can see it rather well.

However, one point of information while you have got it up there.

When you refer to the site, could you point out for the benefit of the Commission what the boundaries of the congressionally mandated site actually are?

MR. BROWN: That is a tough question.

MR. COOPER: They are generally what you see on the model here. The perimeter is the circulation path around the immediate area, and here is the lowland right where the land is. There is an arbitrary line that the land is cut off on.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So it would go all the way to the encompassing path?

MR. COOPER: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Could you point that out on the design?

MR. BROWN: Here it is (indicating).

MR. COOPER: Where the X is.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And it goes down to the curves to the north as well.

MR. COOPER: All the way here where it necks down, you have a cutoff and that is the end of the site.

MR. BROWN: We drew the line in of the tree angle and we thought that was an important line for your consideration.

We also drew the radius of the wall dimensions and we thought that was an important dimension. Our zones are located between those two lines.

Mr. Chairman, something you know far better than I do, we did look at the distance factor on the statue as far as body gesture, head position and eye contact, and at what dimensions from certain entry to circulation paths these were visible and weren't visible, and that was another reason for coming to this 180 plus minus five location beyond 200 from

O., INC.

the walkway, we felt body position was less visible than acceptable and head vision becomes visible as you approach it, 180, 150 feet to -- you see position. Eye contact we thought was something to be discovered as you move closer to the subject.

As we looked into these questions, we could see what needs to be debated and what these dimensions are. With that, we prepared this drawing.

I believe that you will recall from the exhibit that opened several weeks ago the sculpture was located over here and there had been constant discussion, I think creative discussion, among everyone for the best solution, for the site in question, and we feel that is the location right now.

And with that, we can place these objects in the area. You may want to stand up.

I would offer several points of advice in viewing the model. The tree positions on the model are not entirely accurate. They are on the analysis drawing and the site plan. You can see the growth patterns also of the trees on the analysis plan, and that concludes what I have to say.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Fine.

I would like to say that at the appropriate moment, which is presumably after we have heard the testimony, the

., INC.

Commission plans to go over to the site so that they can take one more look at it, the way it looks today, although it may be a little damp, and then we will return for the final determination here. So that we would adjourn the meeting at a certain point just for a quick site inspection, which we want to do with the benefit of all the testimony in our heads as we go over there, and then we will come back here. And that will be later on in the afternoon.

At this moment, if there are members of the Commission who would like to --

MR. COOPER: Mr. Chairman, we were not quite done with our presentation. We have another issue.

MR. BROWN: Also have the styrofoam in the trailer waiting for your arrival. They will be in place when you get there.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It won't be for awhile, looking at the number of people that want to testify.

MR. COOPER: Secondly, the issue of the flag.

We have long held the opinion that our Nation's flag should not be included in any composition without extreme care. It is a powerful symbolic element, demanding a precise locational concept. In consideration of this, we would like to share with you the fact that multiple locations,

each one having some pros and cons to it, were reviewed. I would like to use a little bit gross -- a little bit over-scale a model of a flag, but it is large enough so that I think you can see it to discuss these locations with you.

First, we would like you to see the -- the point of the departure that James Webb talked about, which is the placement of a flag literally at the apex.

The positive aspects of this location would obviously be that the entire horizontal thrust of the walls would be resolved upward into this element. The negative aspects of it, of this location, would be that the basic unresolved contemplative geometry of the ground would be resolved into a single vertical element and this, of course, was not the intent of the basic design. There are a variety of locations which are behind the apex, here, here, here, which also have been considered.

The positive aspects of such a location would be that any viewer facing the walls, would not be able to view the walls without viewing our flag simultaneously. The discrete separation from the apex would be interpreted, perhaps, by the viewer as an attempt to separate the flag far enough so that the upward thrust issue is taken care of, and yet the flag would have a separate identity. If placed slightly east

of the apex, which is the location I have placed it in here, a dynamic tension across the apex with the sculpture would be established. The negative aspects of this location will inevitably be that the flag staff, given the foot foot plus length of the walls, may have a scale problem somewhat reminiscent of a golf course. In addition, the flag would not be properly viewed by those persons who are walking along the path below near the apex. From that location, when visible, the flag staff would then appear truncated.

A third possibility, of course, would be the location of the flag with the sculptures. The positive aspects of such a location would be to concentrate the added elements so that they might gain symbolic power. The negative aspect is that the proposed sculptural concept, unlike Iwo Jima in many ways, does not use the flag as an integral symbolic element. This sculpture and that location do not seem to coalesce.

Finally, the fourth possible location of the study was a location of the flag near the west entry to the site. The positive aspects of this location are that it places the flag at a "western destination" opposing the ring of flags at the base of the Washington Monument, allowing the face view of the memorial walls to remain unencumbered and making the

"flag experience" essentially one of pedestrian circulation, both on top of and "inside the walls." The negative aspects of this location are that it may be considered too remote.

This problem of flag location has indeed been difficult. A clear consensus has not emerged. The Sculpture Selection Committee has recommended to you location for a flag staff that is generally opposite, across the apex, in the location that I have indicated here.

There is a broader consideration that is also of importance, that is the design of Constitution Gardens, and the whole Mall park itself. Any location which places the flag on or near the apex will make the flag not only a Vietnam Memorial event, but will also make it the long view "identification element" for the entire Constitution Gardens area. A direct view exists from Monument Hill directly into this site. We ask you also to consider this aspect of flag placement in your deliberations.

If you would like, we have additional information with respect to the design of the base of the flagpole which seems to be consistent with any one of the numerous locations. The height of the flagpole, which I would assume, which has been nominally forwarded to you is 50 feet, would be adjusted somewhat when the exact location is known. It could be 45,

it could be 55.

Finally, if you would like to see a little sketch of the locator device which is essentially a three-foot high round ground cylinder that has the directory of names built into it, in a weather protected way, we would be happy to give you one.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes, we would like to see one.

MR. COOPER: I see nodding of heads so I will do that.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Where would be locator be put and why?

MR. COOPER: The locator device would be placed along the path, essentially at the west end. This has been designated as a handicapped entrance to the site. The reinforcement has been extended outward from the walls in this direction. It is felt that that seems to be a visible and sensible location for such a device to be placed. It is possible to do more than one of the -- if this turns out to be the case, we are proposing to use a standard, really an off-the-shelf element. The locator itself being in the form of a book, not unlike a telephone book, except the larger type than the locating device system.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Waterproof.

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

MR. COOPER: When the book is not in use, it falls back, as you can see, into a waterproof case. And this is a telephone company approved system for the preservation of a document of this sort.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And would you replace the book then if pages became torn out?

MR. COOPER: That is correct.

Are there any questions regarding the issue of placement?

MR. NETSCH: Could that be pointed out on the drawing, please?

MR. COOPER: It sure could (indicating).

MR. NOVAK: If I could have the placing of the flag, the west end flag, the comparison?

MR. COOPER: West end flag, if that were ultimately your recommendation, would be placed approximately in there and the locator device would be outside that.

MR. NOVAK: What was the last consideration you mentioned with the effect to the monument --

MR. COOPER: That because of the opening in the trees, there is the one leak in the site, it is entirely tree surrounded all the way around, that this view, of course, that this points straight to the Washington Monument, anything that

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

is in that area in terms of a flagpole is what you are going to see from Monument Hill is the Vietnam Memorial. A 50-foot high pole will become the visual distinction of the whole Constitution Gardens experience. Because that is the only thing that sticks up.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: How about from the Lincoln Memorial? If it were done western site, would it be visible from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial?

MR. COOPER: It would be visible from the Lincoln steps only in winter because the foliage is so dense you could hardly see through.

When we were trying to locate the memorial walls, which was done during the season of foliation, we had a dickens of a time getting a site really on that. So it is really dense. It is quite bare in the winter.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right.

Any further questions?

MR. NOVAK: Would you consider the entrance on the west end as a handicapped?

MR. COOPER: We have taken the position from the start that the memorial could be accessed from any side equally and with success. We know that the tourist path is basically from -- this is the point of arrival, from the

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

Lincoln Memorial, right around in here. And by virtue of not taking the path on out and allowing this thing to float, this grass, we try to say come as you want. The trees are all trimmed up, it is a series of stalks with free pedestrian circulation all around them, and we don't really care. We did feel that it was quite important, given the idea of having this float to take care of the wheelchair. We have done this with the reinforced turf system, by means by anchor mats, which is the same thing put under pro football playing fields.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You remember that we pointed out access for the handicapped in the previous meeting.

What is the tourmobile route?

MR. COOPER: Mr. Brown, I don't think that this has been finally settled as to where the stop is going to be. I heard a couple of different things. One is obviously along Bacon Drive, right at this end. Another one would be a single stop for both the signers memorial and the Vietnam Memorial. I don't know which that is going to come out. This is the closest -- this end is the closest of automotive access to the site. Henry Bacon Drive. This is right up here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right. Thank you.

Any further questions by the members of the Commission?

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

Then Mr. Scruggs.

MR. SCRUGGS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I am James Scruggs, President and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

I am very much honored to be here today speaking before you once again, and I would like also to express my personal appreciation to your beginning work on the long overdue Veterans Memorial.

Just to clear up any confusion regarding our recommendation for the location of the flag, we do recommend that it be behind the apex where it's presently sited.

I would now like to read a letter from a former member of the Commission of Fine Arts who was a juror in our design competition and a very prominent internationally known landscape architect, Mr. Sasaki (phonetic). He writes:

"Dear Jan: I unfortunately shall not be able to attend the Fine Arts Commission meeting held to review the sculpture and flagpole. Obviously because I have not seen the proposed sculpture nor its relationship to the memorial wall, I cannot express an opinion as to its design or its artistic merit. Moreover, it is properly the province of the Fine Arts Commission members to decide this question rather than mine. I would like to note, however, that in any competition, a jury

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

may select a winning design, not because it is so perfect that it cannot be improved, but because it is the best of the lot. I remember at least several jury members in evaluating the winning selection, expressing views on how the design should be modified to be more suitable for public use. The matter of public safety is one approach to all, from the upper side is one question. Matters not only technical but aesthetic were also discussed. Thus, it is not certain that the design by Maya Ying Lin need be irrevocably compromised by the changes which require technical, visual or, indeed, programmatic needs. As I understand it from verbal descriptions given to me, the proposed sculptural group by Mr. Hart is not part of the visual mass of the wall but is placed at some distance and in opposition to it. Other works of other artists, if sensitively done, enhance the totality of the design. I hope the latter is true." We certainly appreciate the letter from Mr. Sasaki,

In closing, I do wish to state that I formed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund a little over three years ago to create a national memorial honoring my fellow Vietnam veterans and, of course, I served there as an enlisted man with the United States Army. I was wounded, decorated for gallantry, and I am proud that the names of all who fell in

Vietnam will be forever on the Mall. It was certainly never my intention of this project to become the object of so much disagreement and so much controversy. Yet, it was never my intention for this project to be viewed as a textbook example of how to select a public work of art.

The statue is a great tribute to those who served in Vietnam who are very, very highly praised among Vietnam veterans and among those who once again want to be united behind building this national memorial.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

This, I take it, completes the leadoff presentation and we now open the floor to the people who have registered their support of the proposal. The first being the Under Secretary of the Department of Interior, Honorable Donald Hodel.

MR. HODEL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you on behalf of Secretary of the Interior James Watt to outline our position on a very important matter, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. For too long, out Nation largely ignored the veterans of Vietnam; very few were welcomed home with public appreciation for their commitment to duty and service to their

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

country. This, of course, was a marked contrast to the welcome accorded to veterans of previous conflicts.

Fortunately, there were those with the requisite courage, foresight, and compassion to act to ensure that this wrong was corrected. Hence, efforts were started to authorize, build and dedicate a fitting memorial to the thousands who served our country in Vietnam. The effort bore fruit in 1980, when Congress enacted PL 96-297, which authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, VVMF, to design and construct a memorial to our Vietnam veterans.

Of course, we are all familiar with the controversy that has engulfed this project since the initial design was accepted by the VVMF. Many argued that the initial design was appropriate; others maintained it honored only those who died in the war, and some contended it made an unacceptable political statement about our Nation's role in Vietnam. It was particularly distressing that much of the criticism came from the veterans themselves who are, after all, the group we are seeking to honor.

Since the Secretary is required to approve the memorial pursuant to the terms of the Congressional authorization, we were subjected to considerable pressure to totally disapprove VVMF's initial submission, radically modify it, or

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

insist that the design process be started all over again. Simultaneously, many Members of Congress with a deep and abiding interest in the memorial were also seeing and feeling the results of the controversy. Fortunately, a group of Senators and Representatives under the leadership of Senator John Warner intervened to determine if an appropriate solution could be devised. Following consultation with interested Members of Congress and veterans, Secretary Watt committed himself and the Department to working with the Congressional group and the veterans organizations to achieve a resolution.

Others can provide more explicit details of the long and often difficult sessions that Senator Warner chaired. The result of these efforts was a basic agreement among the veterans that the initial design would be augmented by the addition of a flagpole to fly the American flag and a sculpture depicting a serviceman or men. This became known as the "compromise." This compromise was accepted by the veterans. It was accepted by the interested Members of Congress. Based on this consensus, the Secretary then communicated with this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission regarding the compromise and received assurances that led him to believe that both would act favorably to approve the design refinements. Following such general

acceptance and the receipt of assurances, the Secretary issued the required construction permits to VVMF. Let me repeat that the Secretary of the Interior has acted in good faith to carry out this compromise, with assurances from this this Commission that a flag and sculpture would be approved.

VVMF acted quickly to make the refined design a reality by commissioning a noted sculptor and taking steps to determine a suitable location for the sculpture and the flag. On September 23rd, VVMF submitted the sculpture design and siting and the location of the flag to the Secretary for his review and approval. In keeping with our commitment to the compromise and our desire to support the veterans, the Secretary quickly and enthusiastically approved the refinements and submitted them to this Commission for your consideration today.

We have, however, made one change from the previous arrangement in March to accommodate the concerns of the veterans organizations. Originally, it was agreed that the memorial would not be dedicated until it was complete, including the flag and the sculpture. It was brought to the Secretary's attention that a National Salute to Vietnam Veterans has been scheduled for the period of November 11 through the 13th, 1982. Veterans groups led by the American

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AmVets, and the Disabled Veterans requested that the memorial be dedicated during this salute when thousands of veterans, especially including those of the Vietnam conflict, will be in Washington. Since it would be fitting and appropriate to dedicate this memorial during this salute, the Secretary indicated that he is prepared to issue the requisite permits for a dedication to occur. However, we remain totally committed to ensuring execution of the compromise.

Accordingly, we will issue the dedication permits if the compromise design refinements are approved by this Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission even though the sculpture cannot be completed in time for the salute. To permit dedication of the memorial to proceed if the flag and sculpture have not yet been approved would be to break faith with all those who negotiated in good faith to reach a compromise last March.

Consequently, we urge the Commission to approve immediately the design refinements submitted to us by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and transmitted to you by the Secretary. The Secretary has personally viewed the model of the sculpture, seen the site model indicating the location of our flag, and walked the site of the memorial. He believes

that the addition of these items will create a powerful monument to those who served out country in Vietnam and to those who made the ultimate sacrifice. We find it incomprehensible that adding a sculpture of three servicemen and our Nation's flag constitutes an affront to anyone or diminishes this memorial. We also believe that we must remember the purpose of this memorial: it commemorates and honors the service that thousands rendered to their country. We would do well to listen to those who we are honoring and ensure that the memorial meets with their approval.

Thank you.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Secretary, I am curious. No one in this room is opposed to having the American flag at the memorial. I am just curious as to whether a policy is being established that all memorials have flags? I am just trying to understand. You use the word "compromise."

I don't think a flag is a compromise. Does that mean that there will be a flag flying at every memorial in Washington?

MR. HODEL: I do not believe that issue is before the Commission. It appears to me that this is the result of earnest efforts by people of good will and good faith attempting to work out a very specific and difficult issue.

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

I understand that the Honorable Don Bailey, Member of Congress, would also like to speak at this point.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I have found it necessary to preface my remarks on this subject by making a request that you bear with me because it is a very emotional issue for me. I want to speak to you not as a Member of Congress who has worked on this issue as much as I speak to you from the viewpoint of a Vietnam veteran who has spent many, many months in very heavy combat in Vietnam, as someone who has been deeply affected by the return to a country I love very much and has been involved in trying to bring together something that no mere issue of aesthetics can take away from this issue, and that is the context of feelings, emotions, history and purpose in which the memorial is going to be built and is going to exist.

One thing that I would like to do away with at the outset was something which is very, very sad. There has never been involved by the people who work on this memorial, on either side, on any side, the multitude of issues that we have faced, any issue of racism. I know that you have a very important decision to make, all of you, and it is very important that you make it in light of a number of ideas, and

O., INC.
enue, N.E.
0002

I know that you are sensitive to that. It is very unfortunate that the CBS report on this issue conveyed that impression. I had never heard it raised. I made a number of speeches on the floor of the House, I have heard over a thousand, and I reviewed them just this morning, correspondence that never had a single objection to the ethnicity to the design. Anyone who fought in Vietnam knows that we fought along Thai soldiers, Orientals, Koreans, Orientals, both of those groups were terrific fighters. We fought alongside South Vietnamese, some of which were just outstanding. That is not an issue. Please don't believe that. It never has been. It has been created and thrown into this, and it never should have been.

When the whole effort got underway, I had initially objected because of the desire not to invoke any sort of political message or avoid that as a message in itself, that was an objection that I had originally raised.

I think the issue that you are being drawn into, and that is why this room is full today and why you have so much media attention, is not the issue of aesthetics. The issue still remains for the United States of America why the war was fought. As that memorial is built in that clash of ideas, the memorial is being built at a time when the legacy of the war itself turns to the sufferings of the veterans who

., INC.
nue, N.E.

sacrificed their lives, and the legacy in this country, and now what exists in Vietnam are all converging, and it is a legacy of someone who is proud of their service, someone who believes strongly in the reasons why that war was fought and still does. But the difficult legacy that is being faced now does not reflect poorly on those who fought there. Out of that strong belief, and it is shared by a great many, there were meetings held. I daresay that the individuals who I think jealously guarded and properly so their initial involvement are good people, well intentioned people who, in a spirit of compromise, compromise agreed with those who objected, but the fair thing to do was to make some alterations in designs. Those alterations cannot and do not violate the aesthetic purity of what has been done. At least not in the opinion of those that care about the message that it conveys. Fundamentally, that message is political whether anyone in this room likes it or not; whether our country likes it or not. It is an issue that you as a Commission are going to have to face if you remove, for example, in a meaningful way the American flag from the recommendation that has been made, it is going to raise a question of the value and message of that memorial.

If you do away with the statue, if you place it too far away or do something with it, I notice the question you

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

ask, the reason I say this, you asked a question on site, my mind began to work obviously in terms of will it work, that is available to you in that definition. I only ask, and I beg all of you in the most humble way that I can, not as a Member of Congress or not as a legislator with authority to write law, but as a veteran of that war, that you please consider and understand that -- and this is my personl opinion, for the vast majority of American soldiers who fought in Vietnam, who are still tortured, deepfully and painfully tortured by the one question that still clouds the entire issue, that question whether or not they fought for a proper reason. Because that is what baits at the pride. That is what carries the message of an insult, that in light of recent history of the boat people, of the incredibly large number of refugees from that country, the greatest political outmigration in recent history -- you see it nowhere in this country in terms of population in this country -- virtual genocide in Cambodia, that you allow us please to carry a message of honor and respect and recognition of the reasons why that war was fought, by allowing us to add in the compromise fashion that has been suggested to you these very basic and surely, from an aesthetic point of view, hopefully minor design changes. But they represent a huge world of difference to us.

Personally I had felt that the most important thing that could be done was the inscription, and I basically lost that battle. Although it would be one that basically the flag policy will make references to at least one issue of ultimate political value. A simple thing called freedom that maybe doesn't mean much in a free and wealthy society. But when your face is dirty and a friend is dead and you haven't bathed in a long time and you are hungry, and you are surrounded, and you don't know if you are going to live or die, there is an issue of pride that keeps you pursuing what you believe in. And when you see newspapers and magazines and letters from home, and you pick up pieces of paper alongside a trail crediting North Vietnam, telling you to repatriate yourself and jump President Johnson's dirty imperialistic war, you have to look inside yourself for a degree of persistence that carries you through. As a leader, something that you can reach for that enables you to put your hands on a fellow citizen, there were black citizens, I had superior officers that were black that were fantastic leaders, I had Japanese-Americans, Filipinos, Hispanics from the United States, Hispanic ethnicity, you had to have a reason why you tell a kid something that is going to take his life. That is what that statue is and that is what that flag represents to us.

, INC.
nue, N.E.

I really plead with you to give us that. It is not much to ask. I am not a judge of the aesthetic of that wall. I think it is pretty standing by itself, I guess. I just question whether or not the purpose and the intent standing by itself are the reason for the memorial to stand. I hope that in the evaluation of that those things there that you are much better schooled in appreciation of art, I don't know, because I don't have that expertise, that you will consider the message. There is a political message. No matter what is done, I will not change it.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We now proceed with those who have requested to speak in support of these modifications.

I would remind you that, as published in the Federal Register, our guidelines ask that testimony be limited to a maximum recommended by the Chairman in the circumstances which we would hope would be three to five minutes, and that each speaker try to limit himself as much as possible to new material, new thoughts or arguments that have not already been established in the record. You can understand the reasons for this. There are limits in the number of hours in the day and one could go on ad infinitum, and the case has

been put most eloquently, but we are particularly interested in hearing from representatives of the veterans' community, and we would like to give them priority in this testimony. So that the first would be Cooper T. Holt.

MR. HOLT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Fine Arts Commission, I am Cooper T. Holt, and I am the Director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington office.

I appear before you today representing the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the proposed sculpture and flag staff for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars represent 1.9 million war veterans and 9,500 posts throughout our great Nation. Among its membership, the VFW has over 530,000 veterans who served in the country of Vietnam.

We thank you for the opportunity of presenting our views. In June 1981, our National Commander in Chief asked all of our Post Commanders for 100 percent participation in raising money for this long overdue tribute to those Americans who served in the Vietnam War. At the same time, we ran a photograph of the basic memorial design in an article describing the project in our VFW National Magazine. This article also asked all posts and auxiliaries to sponsor the

project. The response in the magazine article was extremely gratifying.

In December of 1981, we presented a check of $180,000 to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and an additional $40,000 was sent directly to the Fund by our individual posts. Our support for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial continues undiminished, and we urge you to approve today the basic proposal for the sculpture and the flag staff.

The VFW finds the basic design of the memorial to be eloquent, novel and ideally suited to the environment of Constitution Gardens designed, as you know, by the Centennial. Our members contributed to have this concept built and we observed the gratification that this basic design was completed. We are equally enthusiastic about the proposed sculpture and the flag staff.

While the memorial walls are a magnificent expression of this Nation's belated honor for its Vietnam veterans, the sculpture magnificently presents their courage, their sacrifices and, of course, their youth. It captures one of the perhaps intimate number of moments in war when young men, when in difficult circumstances, far from home, are sustained by their comradeship and sense of mutual protection.

For me personally, a glance at this beautiful work

takes my thoughts to a time when I was many years younger, afraid, but willing and proud to serve my country. The addition of this sculpture to the memorial site will commemorate for every veteran of Vietnam, as they were during what was most expected of them during time of war. The human touch of the sculpture is a significant enhancement, we feel, of the memorial itself. It goes without saying, ladies and gentlemen, for which Vietnam veterans fought should fly proudly above the memorial in their honor. We support its addition to the site. We urge this Commission to ensure that the proposed elements are placed on the memorial site at the most appropriate and artistic location with relation to the walls, yet in such a way that all elements, the walls, the flag staff and sculpture, are integrated units.

Opinions may differ, but one point is certain, ladies and gentlemen. Men and women who serve their country in foreign wars deserve our honor, and this memorial is for them above all else. This November, up to 250,000 veterans of Vietnam will come to Washington for the four-day national salute in their honor. The dedication of the memorial during the salute can be the culmination of this historic event, depending, of course, on your action.

In conclusion, the VFW thanks you again for this

opportunity to express our views and to urge you to approve today the proposal presented.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next Mr. Joseph E. Miller representing the American Legion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission of Fine Arts, I am Joseph E. Miller. I am Assistant Legislative Director of the National American Legion.

Our comments, like many comments referred to here today, are positive.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to present our views concerning the proposed statue design and the flagpole for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

For two years, the Legion has been firmly committed to the memorial and opposed to efforts which would seek to delay its construction and dedication. To achieve this, $1 million was donated by members of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliaries from all across the Nation. This $1 million did not come from a few individuals but rather from small donations averaging less than $9.

Today, the American Legion's support for this worthwhile project continues undiminished and extends to the

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

sculpture designed by Mr. Hart. We recognize that there are those who oppose the statue's design and its inclusion as a part of the memorial. But memorials and controversy are not new to Washington. Eight months ago, in order to bring an end to the debate, supporters and opponents of the basic design met to determine whether certain modifications could be agreed upon which would satisfy the opponents while protecting the basic design and integrity.

Agreement was reached and the modification package was subsequently approved in concept by this Commission. With these actions already taken, we believe that the only question remaining is whether the statue submitted for consideration meets the design modification criteria. In our opinion, the answer is yes. Others, of course, may choose to evaluate the artistic qualities of Mr. Hart's sculpture, but their arguments will always be debatable. We are not critics, we are veterans, and can only express our support for the process in which the basic design and modifications were selected.

We believe it important to reemphasize the American Legion's commitment to the memorial project. That commitment goes beyond our financial contribution. As an organization with 700,000 Vietnam veterans, we are emotionally committed to

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

the completion of this project at the earliest possible time.

We have participated actively in this endeavor during the past two years. We attended the marathon sessions held earlier this year to resolve the conundrum created by those who saw the basic design as a symbol which depersonalized the war and failed to recognize those who served in the war. We listened to all the arguments, and our support for the memorial remained steadfast. However, in an effort to accommodate the opinions of several recognized spokesmen of the Vietnam experience, we agreed to the modifications which addressed their concerns.

We expressed our commitment to the process by which those modifications would be selected. That commitment remains firm and we are here to advise the Commission that we support the selection of Mr. Hart's submittal, as well as the flagpole. It does provide a human element to the basic contemplative design, the combination of which creates a dignified and eloquent tribute to those who served in Vietnam. We have heard and will hear many opinions regarding how best to honor Vietnam veterans and how best to select designs for public art and public monuments. Yet, we are convinced that no matter how sincere the effort, perfection in method and design will continue to be elusive. The crucial fact is that

this memorial is for and about Vietnam veterans.

Therefore, the American Legion urges this Commission to approve the design modifications which have been submitted for its consideration. We further urge that an approval decision be rendered today.

Mr. Chairman, the preceding statement has been wholeheartedly endorsed by the Amvets, NCO Association, National Association for Uniformed Services and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, representatives of which are in the audience now. The endorsers represent over 575,000 members, 175,000 of which are Vietnam veterans. When combined with the membership of the American Legion, these organizations represent the views of 3.2 million wartime veterans, 925,000 of which served during the Vietnam era.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Mr. Morgan S. Ruph, Amvets.

MR. RUPH: Mr. Chairman, I am Morgan S. Ruph of Amvets.

On behalf of our 200,000 member organization, we express to you our appreciation for the opportunity to come before you today to present our views on the proposed

additions of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Amvets has supported the Vietnam memorial since its inception and have contributed a substantial sum to its construction. We feel that we have been actively involved in the process over the past several years, and our membership is extremely interested in having this memorial dedicated as soon as possible.

We agree with the positions presented by our fellow organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and we believe that the time has come to put aside controversy and debate over this memorial. We feel that the additions of Mr. Hart's statue and the American flag will offer a positive enhancement of the basic memorial design.

Further, we believe that the additions to the existing design will provide an eloquent tribute to the two and a half million men and women who served their Nation so well in the Vietnam War.

On behalf of the entire membership of Amvets, I am proud to say that we thoroughly concur with the presentations made by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and its supporters and we urge this Commission to grant final approval to this project, and we look forward to your favorable decision and hopefully a dedication at the conclusion of the national

salute to Vietnam veterans in November.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Admiral Mark Hill, Naval Aviation Association.

MR. HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify, and I will do it briefly.

I represent the organization of Naval Aviation Association, the Chairman of which, Admiral Thomas Moore, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was able to get Senator Warner to set up the meeting from which we developed this compromise.

I represent an organization of people who made the greatest contribution in the Vietnam conflict in one service, the U. S. Navy, and that is our Naval Angels. We are all professionals. Whether or not we spend a lifetime in the service or just do obligated service, we are volunteers and professionals. We must be to survive on and off those ships. Everyone of our men, almost without exception, to our pilots was involved in the conflict because of the limitation of the numbers, and easily those who sacrificed as much as those who lived in the prison camps of North Vietnam were largely Naval aviators.

Our initial objection to the memorial was that it indeed was a memorial only to the dead, in between the two greatest living memorials in the world, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

So the compromise which is represented here by the very moving statue of the combat soldiers and the flag was important to us. Every Naval aviator is going to leave that ship with one thing in mind, returning and victory. He is dedicated to his country, to his service and to his own Army. Not one living or dead, not one who gave his life or one who sacrificed his life or risked his life did it for the purpose of getting his name on a memorial. He did it for the purpose of keeping that flag flying. And for that purpose, if none other, I can't think of any more important reason than to accept this compromise with the combat soldiers and the flag.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Major General J. Milnor Roberts, Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, on previous occasions I testified before you in support of the original concept which, of course, we would like to see presented.

At this time, I am representing 125,000 commissioned and warrant officers of all the services, more than half of whom were on duty in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam period. I would like to add our support for the proposed compromise which has been presented so eloquently.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Emogene Cupp, American Gold Star Mothers.

Is Ms. Cupp with us? Someone else representing them?

MS. WILK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Regina Wilk from Silver Spring, Maryland. I am the mother of three Marines who fought in Vietnam. One came home safe and is presently a Captain in the Marine Corps; one came home wounded and is disabled. My third son was killed, thus making me a Gold Star Mother.

I am a past National President of the American Gold Star Mothers, an organization of mothers whose sons and daughters died in line of duty in the Armed Forces. My credentials speak for themselves.

This past July, I spoke to many mothers at our national convention about the memorial, the memory of all who served in Vietnam. There was general praise, both for the

basic design and for the sculpture depicting our sons and the flag of our country under which they fought. Many mothers are coming to Washington to attend the National Salute to Vietnam Veterans and the dedication of the memorial. Yet there may not be a dedication unless you act today to approve these proposals. You, the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, have the experience and knowledge as to where the sculpture and flag will be best located.

Please ensure, however, that we who have most recently visited will seek our memorial, one memorial. I looked forward to the dedication for so long. So many lives will be touched so many different ways during this week.

So on behalf of the Gold Star Mothers, I urge you to approve the sculpture and flag. I am deeply moved by the beauty and dignity of the walls. I am deeply touched for I see my sons in these figures. It is a beautiful enhancement to a fine memorial. Many parents and Vietnam veterans have planned to come to Washington for the dedication this November. Many could not afford to come back to Washington for the dedication if it occurs at some future date.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. Thank you for letting me present this and perpetuating the memory of our sons.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Frank McCarthy, President of the Vietnam Veterans Relief Foundation.

MR. McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission.

My name is Frank McCarthy. I am President of the Vietnam Veterans Relief Foundation. We deal with the health problems of Vietnam veterans and their families.

I first would like to commend Ms. Maya Lin for her design. I have seen the design constructed and I must say that it caused great emotional feelings to be raised seeing those names.

However, the Vietnam veterans were suffering ill health problems, are committing suicide, as we all know, and these factors must be considered. They have seen these sculptures, they have been moved by them. They relate to them. This is a factor that we all must really consider.

I urge you, please, to approve those sculptures, approve those flag for those men as well as the men who died.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Andy Messing, Vietnam veteran in the Constitutional Caucus.

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

MR. MESSING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am a twice wounded infantry veteran of Vietnam, under Vietnam Veterans for Reagan, a member of the Reserve right now, along with the Reserve Officers Association.

I would just like to quickly pose a couple of things that have been said. I see my son in that statue. That was very poignant. It means a lot to me. Congressman Don Bailey said there is a political message to the memorial, referring to it. These concepts bring tremendous amount of thought in my head that based on time I would just cover one thing. Compromise. Compromise that many of us fought for is being disregarded. It was a five point compromise. One, it talked about the flag; two, it talked about the heroic statue; three, it talked about the location; four, it talked about a dedication date; and, five, talked about the appropriate inscription.

The site's architect, as he did during the compromise meeting, totally ignored what the people in the meeting were saying. I would like to take one opportunity to point out where we feel in the compromise, the majority of the compromise, the people in that meeting feel that that statue should be placed to negate the political statements.

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the audience, we

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

felt that it should be either on the hypotenuse or inside the hypotenuse. Right there. The flag should be at the apex. Anything else would not negate the political statement.

Mr. Chairman, I request that you consider this. I would also like to enter into the record comments by Mr. Paul Gapp, one of the leading architectural critics of the Chicago Tribune, and I would like to distribute it at your table.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

While he is doing that, we might call on David DeChant -- please correct me if I mispronounce these names -- speaking as an individual Vietnam veteran.

MR. DeCHANT: You did it very well, sir.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I want to thank you for the energies and expertise in guaranteeing that the men and women who served honorably in our Nation's longest war are recognized and honored in a tradition that began with a Revolutionary War, continued through the Civil War, through two World Wars, the Korean War and now, 10 years later, the Vietnam War.

To celebrate the peace, to consecrate this place, softly call the names of those we love, those we sadly and

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

fearlessly missed, those who died, these words from an anonymous poem written for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, in my opinion, clearly and with lean force describe the philosophies and the goals of the Vietnam Memorial Fund to recognize and honor those who served and those who died; and, secondly, to begin a healing process, a reconciliation of a grievous beginning brought by the war.

I am a Vietnam veteran who spent 31 months in Vietnam. I was not decorated. I have not written a book although I would like to, and I have not been elected to office. But I served my country. I am dedicated to the honesty of the Memorial Fund and their friends who have taken an idea and have created history. I am highly honored by the winning design of Ms. Maya Lin. Over the last several years, I have observed the process that has left me with some anger and sadness; anger because the individuals who speak out against the memorial design allegedly in the name of all their Vietnam brothers, anger because of the individuals who are not veterans who threaten and attempt to dictate their wills through their power and money for spite and their own ego satisfaction, anger for those who still wish to make a political statement about the war through the memorial which is not permitted by law, is not the intent of Congress nor the

Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund.

The memorial transcends the debate of the war. It is time for political debates about the war and its policies, but the memorial is simply not the place to do it. It must be remembered that the American people sanctioned and donated over $7 million for a memorial to the men and women who served and not to a war memorial.

Finally, sadness because these self-centered interests and political debates seem to have been given a priority over the Vietnam veterans, both living and dead, and their families as a Nation. What is most important is we have a most powerful memorial, a truly magnificent and heroic sculpture and Old Glory in her beauty to honor the men who served, sacrificed, suffered, died and survived. It is my opinion that the placement of the sculpture and Old Glory is placed in your hands as professionals.

I disagree with Mr. Watt's statement that design and aesthetics are the primary concern. They are a latter concern and the philosophy that you have is the philosophy of the Vietnam Memorial to date.

Several weeks ago, I had the pleasure to see the stonecutter put the final task on it. As we watched, a Gold Star mother and father watched us and asked if we could help

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

find the name Robert S. Shuddig (phonetic). After several minutes of looking, we found it. We backed up and observed the father and mother touching their son's name. They began to cry. The father most profusely in his wife's arms. As we approached in an awkward attempt to comfort them, the father apologized for crying. It was suggested to him there is no reason to apologize for being human and feeling the pain of the loss of their son. It is in this vein, ladies and gentlemen, I strongly urge you to approve the sculpture and the flag staff for many reasons but, most importantly, for the Vietnam veterans and their families who are still waiting for recognition and honor, and in order to complete the necessary requirements for the dedication of this truly historical memorial in November of this year.

I would like to close with the following words of a very humble man who knew well the honor of war. With malice towards none, with charity towards all, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves -- Mr. Lincoln.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next will be Michael Milne, Director of the Veterans

, INC.
ue, N.E.

of the Vietnam War, Inc.

MR. MILNE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Robert Milne, and I am the National Director of the Veterans of the Vietnam War.

I would like to say we finally have a memorial to the service of the Vietnam veterans in our Nation's Capital, something long awaited, and long needed, and still we find ourselves divided. It seems even in peace we cannot decide on a good thing. But people will differ and that is what makes them people.

So I believe we have to look at our disagreements with both logic and emotion.

What is the point of this memorial? Is it a monument to war? No, because we are a people who do not want war. Rather the memorial is a dedication to the memory of those who have unfortunately served in a war; it is something of design to help us keep in mind the value and unselfish service of those living and dead, who did what was required of them. It is something also which tells a story to those who did not have to serve. It tells a story of these veterans and will keep telling it for a long time to come.

Therefore, the appearance of the memorial and all the individual parts and aspects of it must be just right in

order to tell that story the way we feel it should be told. It must be a reality.

With that in mind, I cannot see why we are arguing over the inclusion of the statue and the flag. The statue has its own statement to make and I feel it is very much a part of the overall realities. The monument itself is a most beautiful one. It is beautiful in its appearance and it is beautiful in that it pays honor and tribute to those who gave their lives. It is very fitting. But so it is a statue for this statue provides part of the reality. It enables people to see the Vietnam veteran as he was when he fought this war. It is not intended to be obscenely glorious in character. It is a honorable creation of reality. I believe that it does not detract from the meaning or the beauty of our memorial. Rather it should enhance both. This is why. First, it does not obstruct one's view of the monument. It is more out of the way. It is part of the story. It preserves its part of the memory for the veteran and the non-veteran alike. Without actually standing directly before and becoming a physical part of the large monument, the monument can be viewed and the roll call of the fallen can be seen. Any argument that the statue is in the way is invalid. It is only there to be an additional truth or part of the truth. It is not a

counterstatement. It is more in the nature of punctuation.

For those who would claim that the vision of three soldiers, who know what they did, looking as they did, is aesthetically wrong, I have this suggestion. We should, if we believe that, tear down the monument to the courageous flag raising of Iwo Jima. When photographer Joe Rosenthal took that picture, he did not know that the proud nation would transform that image into one of the proudest monuments. We of the grand Vietnam War will never see such, but without a picture of a Vietnam trooper, we will at least have something a little like it. If it is issued that that also be taken away, why don't we take away the Iwo Jima monument? Then we can go to work and take away the statue of the Minuteman as well as General Lee atop his horse, and so on. Let us not depict any soldiers of any war in metal or stone. Let us just offer the school children and the veterans and the people in general just walls with names and only the names of the fallen. Better yet, dispense with the names. Let us just put down the date of the war on each.

I am saying to you such things have meaning and sense in this case. Our small statue is not in the way of a large monument. There can be no harm in its being there. Perhaps there is some harm in its not being there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is R. Jack Powell, Executive Director of the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

MR. POWELL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, it is a pleasure to be here this afternoon.

I noticed as I came in that 15 years ago today I started my first tour in Vietnam and as a young man at that time, I had not expected 15 years later I would still be involved in fighting about the same war.

I would imagine that if I was in your chairs right now, however, the perspective of going to Vietnam might be enticing compared to the decision that you are going to have to make later on.

The PVA is a chartered service organization. All of its members have spinal cord injury or disease. We have been designed in the efforts to create a memorial for those who died in Vietnam for a long time. These funds have enabled PVA to start its fund campaign. PVA has also been involved in certain aspects of the design of the Vietnam memorial. The original design caused us fears about access to the memorial. It would be a blatant injustice to create a memorial and have those who were fighting in Vietnam

unable to approach it. PVA worked with the project director, Mr. Dubick, to reach a compromise to the original design. The result is the hard surface stone walkway that traverses the panels. Another change is the use of implements for landscaping to reinforce the entryway from the west wall of the memorial.

By the way, the handicapped parking area which you asked about earlier are the location of what we call the handicapped entrance, and the locator is done in part to be somewhat close to where the handicapped parking has been designated.

PVA also continued our involvement in the controversy erupted over the basic design of the proposed memorial. We did participate in the discussion led by Senator John Warner which would preserve the original design concept while adding those further elements to the whole which would overtly recognize those who faced their country's call. We understand there are those who oppose these modifications. As an organization of Vietnam veterans, we believe that the proposed statue by Mr. Hart and the other accommodations should be approved as this Commission previously adopted in concept.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate that PVA has put

an extensive effort into a memorial to those who served in Vietnam. We believe that changes incorporated ensuring accessibility to all those who wish to come and visit a memorial will prove effective. PVA has supported the compromise agreement which adds the statue, the American flag and the inscription. As my brother and I served in Vietnam, we were aware of the ranging debate taking place back home in America. As we returned in ones and twos to this, our homeland, we were reminded in often less conflicting way about our service to the country. Time has passed, and with the passage of time we are told that the American people have reconsidered the sentence that they passed on Vietnam veterans. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial seems symbolic of that long called for reprieve.

Now we find that Vietnam veterans involved in a debate and the irony does not escape us. The beauty of it has been said is in the eye of the beholder. If such is so there, then never will we be able to satisfy every beholder with this or any other. It might be in part to mark closed a dramatic chapter, someone's sensibilities might not be satisfied. If that be the case, I ask you to let it not be Vietnam veterans. I think they have sacrificed enough already. We urge support of the plan and compromise, and we

, INC.
ue, N.E.

hope that you will do it very quickly.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We go now to Richard J. Gallant, Service Director, Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Please begin.

MR. GALLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, distinguished guests. I am Richard Gallant for the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

By way of information, we are the only veterans organization virtually chartered composed of combat wounded veterans who are recipients of the Purple Heart medal. As such, it would probably go without saying that we carry our own memorial of Vietnam with us every day of the week. As such, we have watched over the years the sundry comments or controversies that have gone on over the Vietnam conflict and also those which have addressed itself to a memorial to recognize the valued benefits. And I would like to say now on the Vietnam veterans that when you look at all of our veterans from all of the wars, we have perhaps the finest soldiers that ever served this Nation during the war in Vietnam and, as such, we should do all that we can to show them our respect, to give them a memorial that truly reflects

the total Vietnam veteran. And I think you will see that the Vietnam veteran is almost like a microcosm. There are many of them, many shapes, forms, ideas, ideologies and so forth, but they all have one common goal, one common vision, and that was to follow that flag when this country called them. They went there and they did their job, and when it was over, they returned here under the cover of that flag for the freedom and liberties and, as such, we feel strong consideration that we support the American flag as part of this memorial. It is truly an integral part of the Vietnam veterans.

And as we walk through and look at the recommendations and the submissions that have come forward, and we looked and we dreamed and we saw the names we had carved in marble, we recognized that here for posterity are the names of our heroes of this Nation that went forth under the direction of this Nation and who followed their flag and made the supreme sacrifice. And as such, we felt that that was a very acceptable rewarding way to remember our fallen comrades. But then I thought, and we discussed it with others, what about that veteran that returned home? What about that veteran who is making his way through life now? What about the children, the grandchildren? What about posterity for this Nation to recognize what occurred during that particular

., INC.
nue, N.E.

traumatic history that we had during the Vietnam conflict?

Then I saw this statue here. And, gentlemen, it really depicts what the Vietnam veteran looked like. I could see myself, only I wasn't quite that young and didn't have that black hair. But I think that what we have before us today is something that the Vietnam veteran fought for. The right for individuals to have their own ideas but also the ability to recognize others and their ideas and to come to a compromise, and a compromise that would not destroy any of their own principles.

I feel, and the Military Order of Purple Heart feels that by having the American flag, the marble walls etched with the names of our fallen comrades, and this beautiful statue here depicting the veteran as he looked in combat, as something to remind us that the Nation must survive only when it recognizes the value of its youth.

We also wish to go on record that we support our fellow veterans organizations and their statements supporting this recommendation.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to speak to you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

We now go to Donald J. Swartz, Director of

., INC.
nue, N.E.

Veterans Affairs, veterans of the Vietnam War.

MR. SWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I was going to speak basically about our organization, the Veterans of the Vietnam War, and what we have done with regard to the Memorial Fund. However, I am really just going to stand up here and talk as a Vietnam veteran for the members of our organization and for the pro rights mainly of Vietnam veterans.

When this Memorial Fund came about, we supported it. We raised money for your organization. The Vietnam veterans within our organization supported it heavily. We didn't necessarily agree with the memorial as it was originally designed. However, it was a memorial to us and we went along with it. When these proposed changes came about, many of the veterans within our organization had a ray of hope that this would depict all Vietnam veterans.

I cannot see how the putting of the American flag at a monument honoring Vietnam veterans would detract in any way, in my opinion, not to have the flag which we fought for and basically that was the only reason we fought over there, because many of us had mixed feelings on the political issues that were involved, not to have the American flag at our monument would be an insult to us.

, INC.
nue, N.E.

The three men in the statue standing before you depict exactly what the American fighting man in Vietnam looked like, what he was. He was black, he was white, he was Hispanic, he was everything. For others in Vietnam, that is what we call ourselves. We are all brothers who served in Vietnam. Our unity is, I think that is, borne out by people who spoke to you today. All of the Vietnam veterans are speaking in favor of their statue. I cannot see how this would detract from the overall memorial.

As a Vietnam veteran, I am proud to see this, proud to be able to put our support, my personal support to the memorial, and I definitely hope that in your voting you approve these. It is essential to the Vietnam veterans, in my opinion, that this be dealt with.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

I think this concludes the group of veterans. We have others who have asked to speak as individuals -- I am sorry. Please.

MR. PRICE: I would like to introduce myself. I am Brigadier General (Retired) George B. Price, and I guess in the arena of performing arts and the fine arts, I am better known as Leontyne Price's brother. However, if Ms. Price was

., INC.
nue, N.E.

here, I am sure we would both agree that this is a very responsible and sensitive undertaking that challenges us all today.

I also represent a little known organization called The Rocks, which is composed of almost 400 predominantly black organization of senior grade field officers who are trying to perpetuate into the city of the black colleges, the leadership that General Roscoe Cartwright developed in his two tours in Vietnam, and as serving as a mentor for us all. I also belong to 10 other organizations that have been represented here so I feel that I can make some comments.

I believe, sir, that one of the issues that is confronting us here is whether or not an artistic rendition can be improved upon, and I think it is axiomatic that it can. All we have to do is ask the critics and they will tell you very quickly whether you are moving it along. I think, too, we get possessive in this arena and, all too often, we forget to offer thanks to those who are trying to assist us in what we are all about. I think in this respect all of us who served in all the wars, and who benefit from all the monuments in our Nation's Capital, owe to the artists our heartiest thanks. Those of us who served in Vietnam are no different. We owe you our thanks for taking a frustrating, a

., INC.
nue, N.E.

very demanding era and trying to reflect to the American people that which we felt as we served. So we have no argument with you as Vietnam veterans. We offer you our thanks for your support and in trying to bring that message home to all of us, and we are indeed grateful. A very special thanks to Mr. Hart for capturing the sensitivity of millions of American youth who have walked away from their service in Vietnam and saying I have done my job, my country called to me and I responded to that challenge and, therefore, I come home with a clean conscience. That is what is represented in those three young people you see there, and it represents all of those who have served, not just some.

You may be interested to know that many of those who served will not ever be represented in Washington except by this monument because they came from the depressed neighborhoods, who are still being deprived of our rightful place in this world's mainstream of the well-being. So don't let us think we have escaped yet.

I am deeply and passionately thrilled, and that is a hard one, by the offer from our distinguished Secretary of Interior to let us participate in the mainstream of our Veterans Day celebration by, in fact, honoring our memorial on that great day and dedicating in front of 250,000 odd

.. INC.
nue, N.E.

Vietnam veterans. But our concern to you is don't give us any more cowards. We don't need any more cowards and we don't need any more cheese. What we need is our country to open its arms and say be one of us. That we would appreciate very much.

I have no argument with the flag because that is under what we all live today, tomorrow and forever, I hope. The symbol represented by these soldiers who served in Vietnam is something that the youth can look back and say my country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, thank you for you and me. And, Mr. Hart, I owe you a deep debt of gratitude, but I think the challenge here today is to thank our artists for the renditions, to Maya Lin, to say to you that you are very sensitive, you brought to us your best and we accept it, and we owe you a debt of gratitude. And may this moment always serve of what America is about, to be able to come under the umbrella of our flag. I think James Weldon Johnson said, in lifting her voice, and I wrote it down so my sister wouldn't criticize me for making any mistake. When we started, we had an agreement I would not. God of our silent fears, Thou who has brought us thus far on our way, Thou who has by Thy light led us into light, keep us forever unto the path that we pray. That is what our monument is all about.

.. INC.
nue, N.E.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Now, we have a system here whereby the people who would like to speak are asked to fill out one of these cards. We have quite a few to go through on the side of the support for the proposal. If there are any others, I suggest that you be in touch with Mr. Atherton. Keep in mind that there is a finite amount of time at our disposal.

The next person that we have down as wanting to speak is Patricia C. Hughes, who is Editor/Publisher of Stars and Stripes.

MS. HUGHES: Mr. Brown and members of the Commission, I won't take any more time. I am the Editor of the U. S. edition which represents the editors who have spoken so eloquently today.

I would like to tell you that our President and the majority of our organization lend their support to the memorial.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Tom Pauken, appearing as an individual for the Vietnam Veterans.

MR. PAUKEN: I am Tom Pauken, Director of ACTION, but today I am appearing as a Vietnam Veteran.

I know the time is very tight this afternoon, so I will try not to repeat that what has been said, other than to endorse the general consensus which I think is emerging today. I would only add a few points.

I think that which is incomplete, a feeling on the part of many Vietnam Veterans, now is complete. I think the words of the Sculptor Panel, this powerful enhancement will really add a living tribute to the Vietnam Veterans, those who returned, and those who did not return. I think what is remarkable is the leadership of the Vietnam Veterans who put this together, and even though there has been tremendous

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

disagreement as those of us in this room are well aware of, it is remarkable that people were able to come to a room, come to a consensus and resolve it in a sensible manner.

I think the failure to ratify that decision would result in reopening some wounds that do not need to be re-opened today, this year, or in the future.

I think this memorial is for those who served, and I would like to end by quoting from the Sculptor Panel itself, because I think it is so accurate in terms of how this adds to the completeness of the full world. The three figures appear to be walking along a tree wall approximately a distance of 150 feet. The figures are approximately eight feet tall, which is appropriate to retain the message of peace. Caught in a moment of time, they look beyond to the American flag.

Thus a creative tension is established between the human figures and the abstract figures of the flag and wall, all three figures, into a harmonious mode.

I would ask the Commission to consider that eloquent statement in terms of the meaning of this war, and what the design ought to be.

I would only note a personal note, when I first saw the sculpture, I was not only remarkably impressed, but looking at the face of one of the three soldiers, it came to mind, I

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

have seen that man before, and I have seen him in Vietnam, and I think so many Vietnam Veterans who will come to Washington will come away with that same feeling. That feeling, yes, that is one of us, one of the young men who served his country at a time of hope.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next is Rick Abell, Peace Corps.

MR. ABELL: I will make this brief.

As one who was the volunteer for the Peace Corps, and in fact is currently employed by the Peace Corps, as one who was a volunteer for the Army Infantry in the Republic of South Vietnam, and as one who has received an 80 percent disability from the Veterans Commission, one who humbly feels that he loves his country and its principles, it would be a travesty on the souls of the dead, who gave their lives in the defense of a world's Nation, not to approve this sculpture and flag pole. Let us not misconstrue our mission.

We come to honor those who fought for freedom in a noble cause.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Milt Copulos, the Heritage Foundation.

MR. COPULOS: Thank you, good afternoon.

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

My name is Milt Copulos, and many of you may know I was a member of the Sculpture Panel, but I am testifying on my own behalf, because I felt it might be of some value to have the view of a combat soldier.

In many ways I am typical of 2.7 million men and women who served in Vietnam. I enlisted in 1966, I was 19 years old at the time, felt I had a duty as a citizen to serve my country. By the time I was 22, I had completed two voluntary tours of duty in Vietnam, seen 45 of my comrades killed on a mountain top that none of you ever heard of, had Last Rights four times, was retired out of the Army on disability, still, like the overwhelming majority of those who served in Vietnam, I am glad that I served, I am proud of my service, and I would be willing to serve again if asked.

I am sure that my feelings are a little difficult for you to understand. You had to be there, they say. Yet somehow Rick Hart has managed to transcend the barriers to overcome the limitations of language with the sculpture. Somehow he has truly managed to capture the essence of the Vietnam experience.

It has been said that one of the attributes of great artists is the universal ability to communicate. Whether it is a play by Shakespeare, or a painting by DaVinci, a great

CO., INC.

work of art must have universal appeal. Rick Hart's statue does this. It reaches out and touches the soul.

During the process of developing the design, we would periodicially, we Vietnam Veterans, look for the progress. I was struck by the fact that each one reacted in an identical fashion.

First, they would stop and stare, overwhelmed by the figures. You could almost see the memories. They would then approach it almost reverently, always commenting on how a canteen hung. Then, without exception, they would begin to describe the action taking place. Each was able to project themselves into those figures, and to draw upon his own experience, because each of them saw themselves there. No two stories was alike. That is perhaps the greatest test of testimony to the sculptor's merit, the statue's ability to communicate was not limited to those who served, although time and time again it was.

One could see the beginnings of a glimmer of understanding in their eyes, how they perceived the incongruous innocence, the courage, the essential vulnerability of these boys in war years.

How, at long last, they began to comprehend the enormity of the task that they were asked to perform. I would

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

also like to address one other question, that of flag placement.

Earlier you heard Kent Cooper suggest a variety of places. I know that has been viewed many times in your meetings. I would like to emphatically disagree, it has always been the position of those who participated in the compromise that the American flag should be placed properly. The flag, we must remember as a tangible system of the principles for which we fought.

The Americans who went to Vietnam went there for principles. The principles that the strong should help the weak, the principle that to the extent any man's freedom is diminished, every man's is.

Therefore, to fail to give the flag a prominent place could be the great faith of nearly 58,000 names inscribed on Maya Ying Lin's wall. We made an effort to place it so that it would be sensitive to the design already in place, that the flag could be placed prominently, without conflicting to the goal, and continues to be my personal belief.

It has been nearly a decade since the Vietnam War ended, a decade during which most of that concept languished in a no-man's land. For that decade they have seen their service, their sacrifices questioned, their notions of duty

O., INC.

questioned. They were portrayed as misfit suckers, and worse. Yet their homecoming was not complete. It will not be until their service is recognized.

Rick Hart's statue recognizes and honors their service. It can help to make that homecoming finally take place.

I urge you to approve it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Tom Carhart.

MR. CARHART: Good afternoon. My name is Tom Carhart. I represent only myself. I think it is fair to say that I started this controversy a year ago.

I would first like to agree with Don Bailey, in emphasizing, in spite of CBS' derogatory comment to the contrary, no one has ever uttered racism to the contrary; that is a low and vicious slur. I don't care if the Pope submitted this design, or Atilla the Hun, you criticize the art and not the artist.

A lot of people misunderstood what this memorial is about, and you will have to bear with me. This is something that rips at my guts. It is very emotional.

Let me read briefly of something written by Paul Goldenberg of the New York Times, Thursday, October 7. "By

CO., INC.
Avenue, N.E.

questioning the Hart sculpture and the flag pole, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund seems intent on something that speaks of heroism and absolute moral certainty. But there can be no such liberalism where Vietnam is concerned. To try to reflect the pain and anguish is to misunderstand all that has happened, and to suggest that, no less has been learned from the lessons of Vietnam. The Vietnam Memorial could be one of the most important works in Washington -- the insertion of the flag pole not only destroys the abstract principal, inside and outside space that Maya Lin has created, it tries to shift this memorial away from its focus and towards a literal interpretation of heroism and patriotism that ultimately treats the war dead in simplistic terms."

Well, Mr. Goldenberg hit the nail on the head. This is not immoral to the dead. We respect the dead. There were 2.6 million of us who served. Congress authorized, and the President signed into law, permission for the Vietnam Veterans Fund to build a memorial, "in honor and recognition of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Vietnam War."

That is it. No separate designation of the dead from those who returned. The listing of the names of the dead was an aspect of the design, competition brought in for

unknown reasons. You have heard people comment here today about it is hard to die, about when we were young, you must learn to mourn, it is hard to grieve.

Sure, it is hard to grieve or mourn, but this is not a memorial to mourn or grieve. This is a memorial to honor those who served.

You are going to hear from architects and artists later who will say that this is a violation of the competition, this is a confusion of artistic schools. I don't care. I don't think that many of us care. We care, Maya Lin has said in the first place that this was for the dead.

Well, you can come here and feel whatever you want. It is an open black wall, you provide your emotions. That is not good enough. This memorial must, "honor and recognize those who served."

And ambiguous feelings are not good enough from someone from Iowa, or Texas, who comes for their one trip in the life of the Nation, and says look down there at that black wall, that is the Vietnam Memorial that honors the 2.7 million who served.

I am not an artist. I may be wrong. I may be an extremist, but I am not alone. There aren't many who are as moved as I am. We feel wronged by this. This compromise is

O., INC.

literally a compromise, this is not something that was gagged down our throats by anyone else. This is something where Vietnam Veterans went into a room and hammered it out, and we came out with this, and yes, I was an extremist, and no, I still don't like that wall, but the compromise means a whole minute piece, we will accept a statue and the flag, the statue was a blunt appraisal of the way we were. I am moved by it. I am pleased that this emotional feeling could be caught up by a man who was never there, and yet it has been. That is a work of artistic genius.

I would humbly request that you consider the purpose of this memorial, and the background of this compromise, and allow us to have a memorial that would be truly honest.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Michael S. Davidson.

MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for asking me to speak at this hearing.

I am a member of the Vietnam Veterans Advisory Council. I am also a Veteran. I have 36 years service in the United States Army, including service in Vietnam.

I find that the statements of those who preceded me to this podium in support of the addition of the statue,

O., INC.

and of the flag, eloquent indeed. I am overwhelmed, and I, in particular, wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, General George Price.

I would like to direct your attention to the statue which has been often repeated here this afternoon, to tell you that someone who knows soldiers are soldiers, someone who understands the excruciatingtrials of combat, this statue is breathtaking, because Frederick Hart, out of his genius, has captured that unique bond that ties men together in the face of danger, and gives them sustenance, indeed, ties them together in the face of constant danger.

As a bond of love, the bond that causes the soldier to sacrifice his life for his comrades, and therefore, is properly placed on the site of this memorial. It does not intrude, it compliments what man and nature had brought together.

With respect to the flag, I would remind you that these men who served in Vietnam, both the living and the dead, were called by their country. When called, thry responded, and this flag symbolizes that noble act of citizenship.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Scott C. ~~Breder~~ Brewer.

O., INC.

MR. BREDER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission my name is Scott Breder, a Vietnam Veteran. I enlisted. I served as a transalator-interpreter.

My reaction to the initial design was immediate and negative. This occurred upon the winning entry, along with the 1,400 other entries at Andrews Air Force Base in May of 1981.

I spoke before the Commission to express my disapproval early. I prefaced my comments by adding my reluctance to the chapter of the country's history that has been full of controversy. There has been controversy surrounding the design selected.

While some progress has been made to resolving that controversy, all issues have not been resolved.

If I may digress briefly, but to emphasize my strong support for the admissions before us, I would like to restate the opening testimony of that initial meeting of Mr. Paul Spreiregen, the advisor to the jury which selected the winning entry, and which I feel expresses the prevelant thoughts of the jury in this design. These comments may be verified in written testimony of that design.

There has never been a precedent of the design for a war memorial such as this, there has never been such a war

CO., INC.

in the country that may forever remain controversial.

I submit that the memorial is not to speak of the war, or the controversy surrounding it, but only to honor the service and the memory of the war's dead, its missing and its veterans. To give those who served, those missing and those who died, something less than honor is a disservice, and a potential tragic error to the Americans.

I personally feel it is a tragedy of the initial design, that it denies those Veterans, the missing and the war's dead, the honor which the memorial was intended.

Hence, I strongly feel that the addition of the American flag and a statue should be an integral part of the monument, and without them the memorial will not fulfill the intent of Congressional legislation that a memorial be built to honor the Vietnam Veterans, the missing and the dead.

I would like to restate the comments of Andy Messing, that the compromise agreed to on March 11th, 1982, and the meeting chaired by Senator Warner was that the flag be placed at the very apex of the two walls, and that the statue be located approximately 10 feet from the apex, centered between the two walls. That was the compromise agreed to by a majority for submission to the Commission on Fine Arts.

I strongly urge the Commission to approve the

CO., INC.

addition of the American flag and statue as an integral part of the memorial, and not removed from the memorial.

Specifics of the compromise included not only the addition of the flag and the statue, but the specific location as well. That was the single proposal agreed to for submission to the Commission on Fine Arts for their approval.

I strongly urge that the Commission approve the additions, and the specific locations.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Fred Downs?

If he is not here, we will move to Paul Haaga.

A VOICE: He had to leave, also.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Understood.

Edward Lyle?

MR. LYLE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Edward Lyle. I am an attorney in Washington, D. C., and also a resident of this city.

During the Vietnam War I served in the United States Army as a junior officer in Thailand, basically along the border between Thailand and Laos, and Thailand and Combodia.

I am a member of the George Washington Chapter of the United States Army. I am testifying, however, in a

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

private capacity, representing only myself. I am a Veteran, who in the past has opposed the addition of the statue and flag to the original design. I continue to oppose it.

Whether those two items should be added, however, is a question which has been debated in my mind, with ample opportunity for input from all quarters.

Finally, after a good bit of deliberation and negotiation, a compromise was finally reached. I oppose, at this point, any attempt to reopen that question, whether there should be the addition of these two items or not. To do so, I think, might easily create further polarization, and unravel that which has already been done.

I think also, it might delay the dedication to the monument, and thereby do a disservice to Veterans, many of whom will be coming to Washington for that event.

I therefore urge this Commission to consider the question of whether the flag pole and the statue will be added, is a closed question, a settled question. I urge the Commission to consider in its deliberations the artistic merits of those two items, and their integration to the overall monument.

In regard to those questions, I think those two items and their integration have been appropriately conceived

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

and designed, and I urge the Commission to approve their addition.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

John D. Pitney?

If he had to leave, we will go to John T. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am John T. Williams, and I am from Berwick, Louisiana.

I got interested in this thing about a year ago, and gave some money. There was a statement made in 1960 as to why we went. This statue here, and that flag, tells why we went. That wall is nothing but something that came between, and that statement is this, let every Nation know whether it wishes us will or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Mary Louise Dowling?

MS. DOWLING: My name is Mary Louise Dowling. I am a Volunteer for the Vietnam Memorial Fund. A volunteer because I served in Vietnam with the American Red Cross, and I saw many servicemen there, and as I returned, I also worked

CO., INC.

on the POW and MIA, as they returned.

As a volunteer, I have been able to see many of the letters coming in from families, mothers, fathers, relatives. These letters spoke very eloquently about the need for this memorial.

I think the time is now to do this memorial. We have waited too long, and I would urge that the memorial be done just as it is depicted here, together with this very fine addition.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Michael Detmold?

MR. DETMOLD: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I am a Vietnam Veteran from New York State, and I would just like to say, very simply and briefly, that I think the statue is beautiful, and should be included, and I can't imagine any of my fellow Vietnam Veterans who wouldn't feel the same.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And finally, Al Santoli.

MR. SANTOLI: Mr. Chairman, as the author of the best selling book on the Vietnam War, and as a Vietnam Veteran, I would like to make a simple statement that art is

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

not detached from society in which it serves.

As a soldier, I served with many people from various parts of the country, I was in a unit that was half American and half Vietnamese, I saw both Americans and Vietnamese give their lives for what they believed in, which was that flag, the flag of their country. I saw people from various life-styles, from various ages, from the senior officers, who were older people, and the Red Cross people who were in their sixties and seventies, and young people like myself, who were 18 years old, and I won't call it a compromise, I will call it a collaboration, that it brings out the intentions of many people, and I pray to God that we are able to come to an agreement of the combination of the statue and the flag and the wall.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

All right, we will declare the meeting temporarily adjourned for a five minute break.

Thank you very much.

(Short recess.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If we could bring the meeting to order, please.

We have discovered two people who had signed up to

. INC.
ue, N.E.

speak in support who were not recognized, so if you will bear with us, just to complete that part of the meeting, we will call on Richard F. Weidman.

MR. WEIDMAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to address this Commission today,and I will try to be brief.

I speak on behalf of Vietnam Veterans of America, a national membership organization of men and women who served in the U. S. military during the Vietnam War. Vietnam Veterans of America as an organization, and I personally, urge you to clear the way for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to be dedicated in November of this year.

The impetus that has brought us this far began with a resolution introduced by the Vietnam Veterans in Congress Caucus, cosponsored by 235 members, and passed by the Congress in October of 1978. That Congressional resolution called upon the President to declare a national Vietnam Veterans Week at the end of May 1979, for the Nation to finally begin to pay due respect for service rendered to country in difficult circumstances. As you undoubtedly know, Vietnam Veterans Week took on a "life of its own" and became a watershed event for Vietnam Veterans. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund grew out of the energy and spirit of that week, as many

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

people, Veterans and nonveterans alike, agreed that it was time for all Americans to honor those members of the Armed Forces who gave their lives in service to their country in Vietnam. The motivation was clear, decent and pure: to honor our dead and missing fellow citizens who were lost in service to country.

Much has happened since mid-1979. As has been the case in the history of many of our national monuments (i.e., the Washington Monument, among many others), there has been much sound and fury over the plans and design. In all of the tumult of arguments, debates and whatever over designs, proper procedures, or personal and professional prerogatives, only three things remain absolutely clear:

First, that it is right to honor those whom we lost;

Second, that the overwhelming majority of Vietnam Veterans and all Americans support the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; and

Third, the means is at hand to consumate the memorial that is so fitting and so long overdue. I urge you to bear in mind that simple, pure and right goal; honoring our dead ; ; ;and to ignore and/or see through the nonsense to let us get on with our primary purpose. Now is the time.

Thank you.

, INC.
ue, N.E.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

And finally, Leroy J. Manor.

A VOICE: He had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right.

We will move on to those in opposition of the proposal, and we start with MayaYing Lin, the Architect/Designer, who won the original competition.

MS. LIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Today the Commission has before it a proposed addition to the previously approved design for the Vietnam Veterans memoral.

Over one year ago the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund and I appeared before you seeking approval of the original design, a design supported by many of the groups you have heard testify today. You approved that design.

Since you granted that approval some people have voiced an opposition to the appropriate nature of the original design and have sought to amend or alter it by making it, in their words, more "realistic." The product of that effort is the proposal that is before you today.

As the artistic conscience of the Nation, I appealed to the Commission to protect the artistic integrity of the original design.

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

What is realistic? Is any one man's interpretation better able to convey an idea than any other's? Should it not be left to the observer? The original design gives each individual the freedom to reflect upon the heroism and sacrifice of those who served. It is symbolic of individual freedom, which this country stands for.

The original design is not just an object to be looked at: it is a moving composition to be understood as the individual moves through it. It is a journey to the awareness of the service and supreme sacrifice of the Vietnam Veteran. It is a living park, symbolic of life -- the life of the returning Veteran, who sees himself reflected within the time, within the names. It is not a memorial to politics or war or controversy, but to those men and women who served. It leaves the individual with the freedom of reflection and contemplation at a place where he is at once part of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and a part of our memorialized history. The Vietnam Memorial takes its shape from and reflects two great symbols of our country, the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument.

The experienceor visual perception of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial should not be interrupted visually by the abrupt verticality of a flag pole, or conceptually by a

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

sculpture that forces a specific interpretation.

To attempt to make a "unified totality" out of two different works of art fails. These "intrusions" which treat the original work of art as no more than an architectural backdrop reflect an insensitivity to the original design's subtle spatial eloquence. Its use as a retaining wall in the presence of sculpture and flag desecrates the design's artistic integrity. It violates basic principle of design in trying to juxtapose incongruous elements.

The scale and verticality of the flag pole (which from any angle will appear to rise out of the wall) is totally out of character with the sweeping horizontality of the memorial. Paradoxically, the scale of the flag pole is too great for the memorial and too small for the site and the statues -- merely eight feet tall -- are taller than the wall for most of its length. These intrusions as placed rip apart the meeting of names, beginning and end, destroying the meaning of the design. Accordingly, the proposed sculpture and flag pole should not be in visual contact with the original design.

I am not approving or disapproving of the sculpture per se. I only disapprove of the forced melding of these two different memorials into one memorial.

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Robert Lawrence?

MR. LAWRENCE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Fine Arts Commission, my name is Robert N. Lawrence, and I am President of the American Institute of Architects, and am representing this Nation's group of architects, in addition, I am also representing a number of Veterans who have written in to me, expressing their concerns about the addition and compromise to the memorial.

Also, many of the Veterans' parents who lost persons in the conflict have written.

I have been impressed this afternoon by the compassionate elements of those men and women who have spoken in support of the compromise design. They have spoken sincerely and movingly, and it is precisely that the AIA support our Vietnam Veterans, that we are here before you today, to ask that you preserve what we are convinced is a unique, moving tribute to all of the men and women who have served their country.

From inception, the AIA has been supportive of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. We have made a contribution very early in the Fund, we have a display at the AIA Building

CO., INC.

to honor the finalists in the design competition.

I have to admit, and I am somewhat surprised to even be here today, because i feel we are starting over, when in fact we should be concluding the process to construct the memorial, in fitting tribute to those who served in the Vietnam War.

On November 10, 1981, this Commission approved a final design that had been selected through an open competition process.

On March 26, 1982, a groundbreaking was held, and construction was begun, looking forward to the dedication in November, on Veterans Day. And in fact, there should be a dedication, because the original winning design is near completion. This design was the result of a legitimate, tested, open competition process, a process clearly in the public interest.

The Commission is now being asked to approve a new design, a design whose origins are confused, and closed to public scrutiny.

In 1910, Congress recognized that the city needed a coordinated body to look after the appearance of our Capital. The city needed some expert advice on art and design questions, so there would be a planned, cohesive and public

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

appearance befitting the dignity of our Nation's Capital.

To the Commission's credit, this is a beautiful city of monuments, museums, parks and memorials, all belonging to our citizens.

Once again, this Commission is challenged, and has the opportunity to act on behalf of the best interest of the American public by supporting a unique design which was won in open competition, with rules agreed on by all participants, judged by our professional jury, and acclaimed by its sponsors.

A brief chronology seems in order to set the record straight as just what the issues are in this matter. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund chose to utilize an open competition to select a design for the memorial. In doing so, the Fund accepted a long tradition for public landmarks that began in 1792 with the design of the United States Capitol.

By the time registration for the design closed on December 29, 1980, there were 2,573 registrants, of which one-third were teams, averaging three designers each. Thus, approximately 3,800 designers from around the country dredged through in this competition.

On March 31, 1981, the entries for the memorial

O., INC.
renue, N.E.

design closed, 1,421 designs were submitted, an American record for such a competition, and a record for international competition as well.

On May 1st, the jury reported to the Vietnam Veterans Fund with unanimous recommendation that Maya Lin's design be built on the proposed site.

On May 6, the Fund announced the winning entry. Its President, James C. Scruggs, founder of the Fund, was quoted in the press release as saying, "Maya's design best projects our thoughts about the memorial, which is to honor those Americans who had served in the Vietnam War."

And I certainly concur in his remarks. For the remainder of the year, the necessary approvals were obtained from the Department of the Interior, the National Planning Commission and this Commission as well, as stipulated by the legislation authorizing the memorial.

However, sometime in early 1982, a concerted effort was launched by a few individuals unhappy with the design, to overturn the decision recommended by the jury. Accepted by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, applauded by almost unanimous press, and approved by various public agencies involved.

At some point, and through some unknown process,

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

the original design was to be embellished through the dedication of a sculpture and a flag pole. The Secretary of the Interior's decision to accept these decisions then required another round of approval from your Commission and the National Planning Commission. Yet we are considering a matter already decided by you.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund decided it when they accepted it. The competition jury and critical opinions have already accepted the design that is nearly constructed. The question of whether this memorial should have a statue or flag pole, in my opinion, has already been laid to rest.

The Fine Arts Commission has before it, not a compromise, but two different design solutions, commemorating the Vietnam Vets. It also has before us two processes by which the designs were brought forward.

The original design, striking in its simplicity and power, is posed against a new design which uses the original design as a background for a statue and a flag pole. The new design is not a modification or an addition to the original winning design.

As I mentioned, it is a new design altogether. The original designer was a product of a national open competition. The competition process itself is recognized worldwide as a

CO., INC.

method to seek excellence in design for significant projects that have symbolic value, such as monuments and major public buildings. Design competitions have been the subject of interest to members of the American Institute of Architects since its founding.

In 1870 the AIA issued its Schedule of Terms, regulating architectural competition. Over the years, a series of documents were developed to promote fair conduct for competition. Our commitment to fair, open competition is a matter of longstanding.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund wisely decided to use the national competition process, whose rules are recommended not only by the AIA, but also by the Union of International Architects. Proper competition is based on strict rules. A competent advisor, a program establishing the philosophical and practical considerations for the design is approved by the sponsor. A high, qualified jury of experts, judges the entries, and then the competitors are openly requested, and the best design is then submitted to the sponsors for adaptation, or its recommendation.

Let us compare how the so-called compromise design was arrived at. The new design, which is before you today, was not produced by recognized public process. There was no

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

program that was given to the public, no qualified jury that was appointed from the public, no openness to qualified designers.

What served us so well over the centuries of design solutions for landmark structures was subverted. Narrow political pressures produced a totally new design.

Let me make it clear that before you today is not an embellishment of the winning design, it is, as I mentioned before, a new scheme altogether, in which the statue does become the axiom and the wall a backdrop. The statue would be the biggest memorial, seemingly anxious to make a statement about the war, but uncertain about what that statement should be.

This is precisely the kind of thing that the competition program sought to avoid, in what the winning design, in its quietpower and dignity totally avoided. Like the proverbial camel, this compromised memorial was designed by a committee, a committee that did not consult the designer, which would not only have been courtesy, but also accepted standard of professional practice, a committee willing to delay the dedication of this national memorial to those who served in the Vietnam War.

One of the criteria was a design that best honored

CO., INC.
Avenue, N.E.

memory of those Americans who died by serving our country in Vietnam, the memory of those who were wounded, and the memory of those who served.

We believe that a memorial to honor those individuals who died, who were wounded, and who served, should be the best we as a Nation are capable of planning. When the Congress, in the name of the American people, set aside land for this monument, it certainly was not its intent to sanction compromise.

Congress surely expected design excellence. The American people surely demanded excellence, and our Veterans surely deserve design excellence. This was the objective of the original competition process, and this was the objective achieved by that process.

As I mentioned earlier, I have heard from Veterans who are affronted by the original design. We have also heard, just as forcefully, from participants in the competition, as well as relatives of Veterans killed in the war.

I would just like to give you a sense of the comments that we have been receiving. From Tennessee: I participated in the design competition, and feel the jury selected the best design. I lost my brother in Vietnam, and feel that the award winning design is an appropriate memorial.

.. INC.

From California: we feel the changes to a well conceived and properly run public design competition would set a dangerous precedent.

From Delaware: The simple walls of Ms. Lin's design pointing to the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial will include the name of our older son. He was born three days before the Hiroshima bomb went off, and 23 years later he was dead. Please let the names stand for the prayers of the living who visit that spot of a hallowed grave.

From California: as an infantryman veteran of the Vietnam War, I was appalled to read last week that Ms. Lin's sensitive memorial to all Americans who died there is being compromised. I fully support your efforts to block this compromise.

Again, from California: in the final analysis, if the proposed modification is allowed to be executed, Maya Lin no longer wins, and we all lose.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, we do all lose. The AIA is not against statues, flag poles or the American flag. We are for the integrity of the original design. The integrity of the process that has created that design, and the integrity of the public interest which the design serves. We are for the completion of this monument now as originally scheduled.

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

The Fine Arts Commission must insure the public interest is protected, and the design excellence in the Federal City is preserved. Including the integrity of the Mall. This is the challenge you face, as we look to each of you for leadership. Expedience should not allow compromise of a process built on integrity and consensus among participants from beginning to end. We should not allow a patched up modified compromise memorial to be built.

The best design was selected, that is the design that should be commissioned. Our Vietnam Veterans fought, and many died for our democratic process. This same democratic process led to design excellence in the selection of the original design. Our Veterans deserve nothing less than excellence, and the public trust demands nothing more.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

The next speaker will be Paul Spreiregen, Professional Advisor for the Original Competition.

MR. SPREIREGEN: My name is Paul Spreiregen. I am an architect here in Washington. I was also the Professional Advisor to the Nationwide Competition which resulted in the original design for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the work of Maya Ying Lin.

.. INC.
nue, N.E.

As for other credentials, really, except to the present matter, I have been a member of the Regional Planning and Design Competitions. I chaired the latter two. I initiated and developed the AIA National Program of Design in the sixties. I have had a deep interest in the planning of Washington, having come here originally as a designer for a downtown planning effort of 20 years ago.

I have taught as a visitor in schools of architecture, planning and landscape architecture across the country, and I was an editor, a former member of this Commission. My professional involvement with the competition ended in 1981, by which time the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts approved the original design concept with considerable enthusiasm, as I recall, of deep gratification.

Since then I have been an observer, at a distance, to the memorial design development. While removed, I have been quite concerned over the events leading to this meeting.

I have come now to address the aesthetics and urban design merits of the proposed additions, the statue and the flag pole. In so doing, I will try to be precise and specific.

To address the merits of the proposed additions, without equivocation, it must be said that they are not at a

level of quality equal to the occasion. They are a distracting appendix to a design which operates fully only if it is unencumbered. They are a misunderstanding at least of reputation, at most.

The principles of design compromise the wall. They are incorrect. They are a diminution of the intending legislation. They are impractical in several aspects, and they are, as a result, an insult to the aesthetic spiritual sensitivity of Americans.

I will concentrate on the aesthetic aspects of honoring the memory of those who served and died. I do not speak lightly.

Equally, I do not enjoy attacking the work of any architect, or any group of people, particularly those who are here today, but in this case it is regretful.

Last spring, when the Vietnam Fund announced that a flag pole and sculpture would be added to the original design, I became quite alarmed. I knew that the background of that announcement, of the whole memorial design was in serious jeopardy, but I was also alarmed because even if construction of the original design might not be allowed to begin, which fortunately it was, the idea of a statue and flag pole addition was totally incorrect.

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

Only two weeks ago did I see the proposed statue at the Pension Building. A proposed statue design, incorrect in basic concept, serves only to prove that it is neither wanted or needed. Taken by itself, in model form, in uniform, in tiny scale, set in a pedestal indoors, the skill of the sculptor has powerful attraction, but the attraction is deceptive. Imagined in full size, or larger than life size, in real metal in its proposed location, opposite the two granite walls, and judge with real knowledge how the Mall operates, and how people experience it, and what they experience, the statue and flag pole proposal should be dismissed.

Just imagine visiting Arlington Cemetery, the uniform headstones by this Commission, establish this sense of purpose to the soldiers buried there. This establishes the sense to all our Nation's soldiers. It has an equal aesthetic partner, that is the breathtaking panorama of the Mall, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and all the rest together.

What we have in visiting Arlington Cemetery is the individual soldier bound up in comradeship into a hard purpose, and all of them together are bound into the glorious symbols of our Nation, the symbols so clearly arranged on the Mall.

CO., INC.

We have the essence and spirit of the L'Enfant plan carried beyond its original design, the essence and spirit of that plan is to establish clear, visual relationships between the component parts of the city and nature, between its natural features, its symbolic features, its every day structures and its commerative memorials. The visual relationships were designed to be comprehensible, to normal human beings, with normal human sensibilities and faculties.

The component features themselves are assigned, ranged in an easy progression of importance. Democracy and its sustained citizens are are put into a clear and whole relationship working together visually all to achieve a higher sense of purpose.

The Lincoln Memorial is thus the better of things to the Washington Monument and vice versa. Both of these are better seen in relationship to the Capitol, and again vice versa. Yet all this works because there is no distracting clutter to interfere.

So with all the buildings and memorials on the Mall, each claim a degree of supporting role, each in a hierarchy, and each with different courses of success, of course. Each soldier's grave in Arlington gives special poignancy to the dearer cost of democracy. In one place ~~the~~ circling the base

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

of the Washington Monument, a bouquet of American flags serves as a special focus, not flags here and there and everywhere across the Mall, but in one unified ring.

But, come back to Arlington Cemetery for a moment. Suppose now what it would be like if we were to install here and there, in Arlington Cemetery, groups of larger than life soldier statues, in various historical combat outfits, winding their ways through the trees, coming upon the headstones. Suppose some well intentioned citizens proposed such a sculpture for Arlington Cemetery?

And, if not for Arlington, why for the Washington Monument? What would be wrong with having the fife player and the drummer boy marching up, larger than life, and how about some brigades fighting their way through the Lincoln Memorial?

The most you could say about such an idea is that it is a mediocre joke. In the hands of Saturday Night Live it might work up more of a laugh, because that is its practical intellectual level. This is precisely what is proposed.

Is this how you are supposed to honor the memory, with a parody? If you try to examine the President's program seriously, the statue and flag pole becomes serious mischief. The destructive effects are threefold.

CO., INC.

First of all, both proposed additions, statue and flag pole, would serve to distract from the superb and essential visual relationships between the original Lin design and its two primary references, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, The statue and flag pole would shortcircuit that essential linking relationship. We would honor the memory and service less.

Secondly, the statue group, with vertical massing, placed near a horizontal wall element would become the composition of focus, even placed a distance from the wall. Likewise, the flag pole near the apex of the wall would contend with the apex as the point of focus of the names.

In short, the statue and flag pole, at -- can neither support lead roles, nor do they contribute any compositional harmony. They only serve to throw the composition awry. You can take the statue and flag pole out of the composition, leaving the walls, but you can't take the walls away leaving the statue and flag pole. We would honor the memory and service less.

Third, and even more distressing, perhaps most distressing, a figure of representation of specific symbols will serve the limited and so reduce the vast array of patriotism on the part of Americans who visit the site. We would again

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

honor the memory and service less.

That week in April, a year and a half ago, during which the selection jury deliberated, was a high point in exercising artistic judgment for the Nation, and so of discharging patriotic disability. The eight person jury included former members of this Commission, they included combat veterans of two world wars. Neither, however, are the reasons that they served as jurors. They were asked to be the jurors because they were found to be the most able in exercising the most discerning judgment.

Vietnam Veterans made the decision to utilize the selection of these jurors. The jurors' names were made to the two approving agencies, lest there be objection to anyone. Similarly, the jurors' names were made known to the competitors prior to the commencement of the competition, and they were published in all the relevant competition documents.

In evaluating the some 1,420 or 30, I don't quite remember, designs, the jurors gave the most thoughtful consideration to all design possibilities, without bias, including designs that proposed the sculptural elements. There were numerous designs with figurative abstracts, intended sort of one figure or another. The jurors' contention was that no symbols were appropriate for the reason that they

., INC.
nue, N.E.

would arrest a visitor's thoughts, rather than enlarge it.

The jurors reasoned that it should stimulate them in many areas. It should not tell you what to think, and feel, but make you think and feel.

The jury was concerned with thoughts and feelings, and not restrictions. How much more is an open-ended expansive design in any figure of a flag?

Starting from the Lincoln Memorial, then the Capitol Dome, and all the rest, it achieves that full power, only if it is unfettered. That is a way of honoring memory and service.

By adding anything, by, worse, a flag pole and statue, the vast array of possibilities are arrested in flight. Without these additions, I can well imagine present and future visitors to this memorial reflecting on so many aspects of patriotism, and the Veterans themselves will have their own memories to bring out. They don't need a statue.

I can imagine many aspects of patriotism being reflected upon the service of our citizens to our Nation, the bond our Nation has to its allies, our better intentions sometimes realized and sometimes thwarted, and yes, as we must, all those tragic aspects of Vietnam, in the lives given. Because all of that, and much more, has become

CO., INC.
venue, N.E.

unavoidably avoided in the single work of Vietnam.

To attempt to unbalance that range in a memorial through a statue is to reduce the larger benefits which this memorial and recollection of Vietnam and our heroes of Vietnam stand to offer us.

In this, there is no question of right or wrong, but rather of problems, and that I think is a way of honoring memory and service.

To repeat a great work of art doesn't tell you what to think, it makes you think. A great work of art, and not a parody of one, honors the memory and service.

On a more practical level, the proposed statue and flag pole poses a number of problems. I suppose the cost of a Park Service person raising and lowering it isn't that great, but it will be something. The statue, in metal, will not protect itself against the foliage. Bronze would serve it better.

The statue group also has lots of protrusions, fingers, rifle butts and barrels, which are easily broken or bent. Particularly if they are reachable. The Ulysses S. Grant statue at the foot of the Capitol, is worth examining in that respect. Even though mounted on pedestals, its protrusions are broken. The Burghers of Caillaux, designed

for placement at ground level is also a lesson in detailing. Its details are not prone to damage. The rifles in the statue, furthermore, are prone to be vertical, while the rest of the statue group is level, this will distort the statue.

As to placement of the statue and the flag pole, it is not at all difficult to try to relocate it, either, one, 10 or 50 or 100 feet, and it would not make any difference. That they are arbitrary in their locations, shows that they are not necessary.

I would urge anyone to move the flag poles and the statue on the model, and see if it makes any difference. Time does not allow, but in the context of this examination, it could be helpful to examine the monument in Helsinki, the Hiroshima Memorial, the Memorial to the Departed in Milan, of course, the Washington Memorial, the Jefferson and the Lincoln Memorials.

The lesson was learned well by a flier who died in World War II, once wrote, if anything at all, perfection is achieved not when there is no longer anything which can be added, but when there is no longer anything which can be taken away.

One last point to you, the members of this Commission, if I may. It is a misconception, occasionally voiced, that

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

democracies are incapable of planning and building beautiful cities. Edinburg and New Amsterdam refute that, but no city is greater testimony than the one in which we now live. No democracy has created as expensive and artful a capital as has the United States. The roots of its plan are the gifts of Western Civilization, as are the plans' embellishment. It is predominantly classical architecture.

History and the present are able to stand comfortably together here. The credit for this lives in the magnanimity in the original plan and the stewardship of three agencies, the National Park Service, the National Planning Commission and you, the Commission of Fine Arts.

Through you, the Nation chooses its most important art, its most important art. Through you our Nation shifts its embodying symbols. Through a great plan, those symbols enlarge each other and us. Those democratic Nations which have made their capital cities as whole designs, one thinks of Candia and Brazilia, Candia was still under British authority. Little else comes to mind.

Even in part, where is there to compare? How much does London have, or Paris? A single building in most of those cases, tucked aside. No democratic capital expresses so much of its Nation as does ours. A great Nation is honored

only by great works of art. Great art, and only great art should honor great memory and great service.

Our Capital and our law are such great works of art, so can be the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in the original.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Our next is Henry F. Arnold, the Designer of Constitution~~al~~ Gardens.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Fine Arts Commission, when all the furor over the present controversy is forgotten, there are issues that are forgotten today, that will assert themselves in ever growing consistency. These issues deal with specific design context, and the aesthetic purposes of the park in relationship to this ememory.

The civic design context of the Federal Mall has certain criteria which must be respected if we are to respect the Nation's front yard. The intrinsic suitability for art in the Nation's Capital must be judged by the highest standards of art. Appropriate relationships to elements of the place, how does it fit, is it complimentary to the surroundings?

Finally, the question of precedents. Do we want more of the same caliber of work that we are approving today to be built tomorrow? That is a challenge that must be

CO., INC.

answered.

Secondly, there are the aesthetic purposes of the park. These, incidentally, were affirmed by your approval of the plan of Constitution Gardens in 1975. The park was to be a place of dignified beauty, with broad open meadows surrounded by wooded edges. It was to be viewed uncluttered under the canopy of trees. There were to be no interruptions in the ground plane, except the tree trunks and the low ground cover. There were to be no vertical objects in the open meadow. Because the meadows were within view of the Washington Monument. There were to be no flags.

The Washington Monument is provided with this eloquently. How does the proposed addition meet these criteria? The proximity of the new proposal to the Lincoln Memorial diminishes the simplicity of the design by its incongruity.

What about the intrinsic suitability as art? The proposed, undistinguished, made to order statue is a sentimental response to a difference of opinion. The result is more likely to serve as a memorial to pettiness and corruptive endeavor.

Finally, the park design. By itself, the proposed statue is just a small, square on the visual integrity of the

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

park. The flag pole is a jar and intrusion. By their precedent, the park is more likely to become a repository for heroic statues and clashing symbols to detract from the aesthetic purposes.

Considering the importance of this issue, it might be prudent and appropriate for the Commission to delay their decision until each member of the Fine Arts Commission and the Memorial detractors have had the chance to visit the Memorial, after it is completed, and experience the mysterious power of this unprecedented work of art. Such a course might end the controversy, and become one more case in history where great art has become its own protector.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next on my list is Wolf Von Eckardt.

MR. VON ECKARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I read Tom Wolf this morning, and reflected on Maya Lin's wall, and looked, and I couldn't see Jane Fonda in there at all.

More seriously, Tom Wolf does point up a calamity of our time which I have very often long discussed, and that calamity is the enormous gap between what some call elite art and popular art. Between avant-garde and traditionsl.

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

Between representational and abstract. Similar arguments were heard about the Washington Monument, which is, of course, also an abstract monument, and nobody has proposed a figure, an image of George Washington on there, and the problem that we have, which I tried to deal as a survivor, is a difficult one, but I think in time it is going to be resolved. It is, in fact, being resolved through what we all call the cultural explosion, the enormous number of people who visit museums, and the wonderful effort the American museums particularly are making through the proliferation, if I may say so, of critics of the newspapers, even on television, through discussions, and through a wonderful instrument which is peculiarly American, citizen participation in design.

I am very much in favor of all of this, and I think that in the end, maybe in our lifetime, our culture will find the common hiatus found in which we will not have this kind of argument.

I am glad we are having it, I am glad so many people are interested in memorials, and in urban design, and in park design. But we are not going to resolve the gap in our culture through subverting the established procedures. I do not need to repeat the established procedures.

Mr. Lawrence and Ms. Lin have very eloquently, and

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

very, with great detail, outlined them. But most of all, if the democracy is going to work also in the field of erecting great monuments, we need law and order, and I think the Veterans of the Vietnam War, and any other way, will agree that that is, first of all, if we want to oppose the flag, and if we want to oppose the motivation that all people of good-will have, we cannot have law and order if the Federal Government of the United States is meddling in issues that concern art and the public. It is not a Federal issue. It is not for the Secretary of the Interior to conclude what kind of monument we have.

I think the Vietnam Memorial Fund and the Fine Arts Commission should not allow themselves to be intimidated by the threat of their withholding building permits. The Veterans of America come to the Mall without Secretary Watts' permission.

We don't -- if you don't oppose the rules, and if you don't keep hope with our art, we will have ugliness and not art. We cannot compromise on this.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Next I have Michael Straight.

MR. STRAIGHT: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is purely extemporaneous.

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

I am a former B-17 pilot, a former B-29 pilot, a former chairman of the American Veterans Committee and a former deputy chairman of the National Endowment of the Arts.

I listened this morning with respect, and at times, awe, to my fellow Veterans. The Post this morning carried an inflammatory article designed to rub raw an open wound, by saying that this, Ms. Lin's extraordinary design was there to honor Jane Fonda.

I thank my fellow Americans for not falling for this kind of cheap debate today, and for exercising restraint, and betterment of art, and everything that was said.

When the Congressman spoke of near aesthetics, in urging the additions to Ms. Lin's design, I would suggest on the contrary, that aesthetics alone matter here today. If we are talking about non-aesthetics, in relation to the deserving Veterans of Vietnam, then we are talking about hospitals, libraries, schools, not designs in this part of the Nation's Capital. It is solely an aesthetic statement which you are asked to consider as such. It is the final truth.

James Webb, in his impressive opening statements here, defended that concept by saying that there was agreement between all of us, that what was needed was integrated unity

of the whole memorial.

From then on, we have heard only of the word compromise. Mr. Webb himself pointed out that the new integrated unity which he sought, if these additions are made, was one in which the three figures here would look across the wall with its moving names to the flag itself. It would tell a story, as he said, that it is a concept, but it is not Ms. Lin's concept. She spoke of it melding one into another, and thought that even the process of melding would make it impure. But that is not even melding. The two cannot be melded.

I do not mean by this that there was no place for a flag at a Veterans Memorial, or even that there is no place for some precise imagery.

If additions are to be made, then I am begging you, only in the name of art itself, to consult the voice which was heard here only briefly today, the voice of the artist. It may be that in time these additions can be worked in. They cannot be worked in.

The only statement today which jogged between those who came here in a sense of respect to this amendment, and yet urged the additions, and those who like myself speak against those particular additions, the only voice here in assault on that spirit, I am sorry to say, was the voice of the

O., INC.

Undersecretary of the Interior, who in fact said, in a bald-faced threat, either you take what I give you today or else it will not be dedicated in November. Two days in November are a very short period.

But you remember the words of the Romans, life is short, the heart is long. These monuments will be here, good or bad, for centuries, and it is in the interest of centuries, and with love and veneration for those Veterans, we urge you to think only in terms of the very fineness which you can offer them.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Next is Peter Masters.

A VOICE: He had to leave.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: He had to leave.

Former President of the Design Council, Jim Brodniak.

MR. BRODNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am Jim Brodniak, Local Coordinator of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Not all Veterans groups approve of the additional elements.

I also find that the Undersecretary of the Interior, his statement, if you don't accept it, you don't get it dedicated, as absurd.

I am a playwright. I would not have someone take a play that I have written and make additions to it, add

O., INC.

characters, or take away.

The design is such that I can go in, and I can remember, and that is the only thing that has to be done.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Janice Connally.

MS. CONNALLY: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I speak as an individual member of the general public.

I wish to speak for Maya Lin's design, and as originally submitted. The figures have a kind of photographic realism that we associate with the Marine Memorial here in Washington.

Those of us who lived through the Second World War were thrilled by the photographs which inspired this work, raising the flag spoke eloquently to the emotions at that time.

But what are the memorable images from the war in Vietnam? A guerrilla shot at pointblank range, a naked girl afire, running screaming down a dusty road, American college students slain by their countrymen on the grassy slopes.

I think Maya Lin was right in going beyond these kinds of images. She gave us not realism, but abstraction. She resolved all the pain and conflict of that unhappy time in a simple message of sacrifice and quiet heroism.

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

I think additions to her design, in another style, from another time, would be inappropriate, and detract from the solemnity and grandeur of her design.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

James J. Butera.

MR. BUTERA: I am not sure if you called me, but I have been waiting all afternoon, so I will take the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do you want to give your name for the record?

MR. BUTERA: James J. Butera.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is appropriate that the unresolved issues be debated and deliberated in an open forum such as this. It well exemplifies the basic concept that this country stands for, defending these democratic principles, and why the United States has involved itself in most of these foreign wars, and I believe this includes Vietnam.

By way of background, i should state that I am a lawyer by trade, not an architect, and thus I hope to contribute to this hearing simply as one who was involved in this war, who was involved in the efforts of the Vietnam Veterans Fund to raise the money necessary to complete this worthy project.

O., INC.
enue, N.E.

My legal specialization is in banking, so I have no client who is interested here.

To put it as clearly as possibly can be stated, I am staunchly opposed to the modifications to the original design submitted by Maya Lin. I am not going to argue this on the standpoint of aesthetics or artistic integrity, because you, after all, are the experts in that field.

However, from the standpoint of law, logic and elementary fairness, it strikes me as indefensible that anyone should now have a design that is based on free and open competition, available to anyone, and all entries.

Earlier I referred to the concept of open debate as embodying the essence of our system of government. Another fundamental concept is what we lawyers refer to as due process of law. Basically what this means is that no individual should be deprived of rights and privileges, except in accordance with the clearly established, and fairly administered rules.

As applied, the subject matter under discussion here, one could only conclude that this ex parte tampering with the winning design, after the fact, violates everyones' reasonable expectation of how the competition was restructured.

I am very sensitive to the views of the individuals

O., INC.
venue, N.E.

who have been directly involved in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. They worked hard, and accomplished a great deal to bring this project this far along. But sometimes we become so fixated by a goal that we lose sight of the larger purpose, and I would just like to talk about that larger purpose for a moment.

The larger purpose, as best I can perceive it, is nothing more than basic fairness, the fairness that we owe the Vietnam Veterans, because the burden of that war lasts, or rather, the role is not evenly distributed. The Vietnam War was unique.

The Post pointed that out well, but little else, in the article today. It was unique in that we reversed the time honored tradition of this country, that the ones in this society are the ones to do the most when the country is in need.

In my professional field, and I suspect it is true in medicine, the arts, politics and business, one rarely encounters Vietnam ~~benefits~~ Veterans. Because deferments and outs are too readily available for those who wish to take advantage of the situation. Let us not compound this unfairness by violating the rules that were established for selecting a memorial to those who made the ultimate sacrifice.

., INC.

I believe that when called upon we all have the responsibility to give something back to this country, which provides us with the opportunity to succeed on the basis of our abilities, the opportunity is one of the reasons that my grandparents came to this country, they came from Italy, about the turn of the century. Through these opportunities my parents were able to pass on the living conditions to me, as I hope to do for my children.

The design competition for the Vietnam Memorial signifies the opportunities that still exist in this country. Why should this Commission, a government agency, or any person, whomsoever, now seek to deny Ms. Lin the fruits of her creative talents and her abilities?

Reflecting back to 1966, I recall, in vivid detail, the ideals and enthusiasm instilled in all the graduates of the Marine Corps Officer Training right here at Quantico, Virginia. Six of us took a brief holiday before shipping out to Vietnam. Of those six, two died in Vietnam, three of us got back with wounds of varying degrees. One got back unscratched, but I can attest that he attempted suicide on more than one occasion.

When you join the Marines, you know the rules, so there are no complaints. But all of us should complain when

.. INC.

someone tries to change the groundrules, when they don't like the end result. Fairness is not one person or another. It is a concept of patriotism at today's hearing. Patriotism in my view is nothing more than doing the duty when the occasion arises.

Heroism, on the other hand, takes many forms, and it is not to be equated with Bronze Stars, Purple Hearts and medals accumulated in jungle warfare by individuals such as myself.

I am not -- I don't think it is appropriate here, although I would certainly be prepared to match medals and war stories with some of the speakers that preceded me. I just don't think that is the point today.

Most of the men and women who served in Vietnam, and surely all those who died, fall into the category of heroism, doing the unpopular, doing the difficult.

In light of their memory, I urge and plead to the members of this Commission not to take the easy course, but to do the heroic, reject the concept of architecture by consensus. Artistic endeavor by compromise, you have heard that word a lot today, and most of all, reject the political manipulation of an award won in free competition. Nowhere is it written that there can only be one Vietnam Memorial.

D., INC.
enue, N.E.

And so to those individuals who, for reasons sincere, I am sure, they may be dissatisfied with Ms. Lin's winning design, I say go back to work and create another award. This one should have been settled a long time ago, and we are now witnessing just another disservice to the individuals who should be honored.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Peggy Robin.

MS. ROBIN: My name is Peggy Robin, I am on the Landmarks Committee ANC-3c. I came here as a citizen and resident of the city.

Most of the points I wanted to make about incongruity of the statue have been made.

But I would like to add my voice to someone who is neither an architectural expert nor a Vietnam Veteran, but one who will be visiting the Memorial as friends, who are preserved in Vietnam.

I would like to be able to walk through this beautiful and moving park, and look at the monument in quiet reflection and pride, without the fact that three enormous giants are looking over my shoulder. The statue may serve a need of the Vietnam Veteran, if that is so, couldn't it be placed on its own spot, and not left to intrude on the complete

CO., INC.

serenity of the design?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

And finally, Darrell J. Gaebel. If he is still with us, private citizen and Vietnam Veteran.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay.

That concludes this part of the meeting. We are going to go over to the site now, briefly, and then come back.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Chairman, would you be assuming that we will be convening in approximately half an hour?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That is right.

MR. NETSCH: So we will be reconvening about five o'clock?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Right.

Thank you very much.

(Short recess.)

(Balance of transcript, consisting of 13 pages, del'd 10-14-82)

., INC.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We will reconvene the Commission of Fine Arts.

On behalf of the other members of the Commission, I want to thank everyone who came here today, particularly those who testified so eloquently, those who were waiting for their turn so patiently. We understand, I think, the dimensions of this decision. I think that it is not lost on us as human beings or as citizens of the United States the degree to which there is a felt need in this country for healing, and we want to be part of that process, we want to help, we want to be constructive and we want to help heal the wound, and we certainly want to help honor and recognize all of those who served in Vietnam.

The Commission of Fine Arts is a body with a very specific mandate given it by Congress. Its legislation, which was passed in 1910, still is our mission. "It shall be the duty of such Commission to advise upon the location of statues, fountains and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia, and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains and monuments erected under the authority of the United States, and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same." In other words, they are very much an integral part of this kind of process.

We laud the competition that was held and, as all of you know, we have approved the winner of that competition, the winning design, although we made certain caveats at the beginning of that process which ~~was~~ were that it required further development, and that design has, with our interaction, been developed so that many of the practical problems which it posed at the beginning have been overcome. And the result is something, I think, of which this Commission and everyone who had a part in it can be extraordinarily proud.

We have just come back from the site. I wanted my colleagues from out of town to see it now that the grass is beginning to be there. One can visualize what the final effect will be. It is extraordinarily moving. I think the litany of those names is enough to bring enormous emotions to everyone's heart, emotions of pride and of honor in the sacrifices that have been made in serving this country.

We have, however, a mandate to look at these problems in a perspective that is much longer in time than perhaps others have been involved in ~~around this sitting~~ this project. This Commission was integrally involved in long deliberations that brought about the current ~~reform~~ form of the Lincoln Memorial. I was not around in those days, but I do think it validated the idea of having a Fine Arts Commission and the end result

was worth the ~~act~~ agony. It is one of the great memorials in the world.

When the Commission was first asked by the Congress to approve a site to be set aside for a Vietnam memorial, ~~this is~~ it was something that we looked at very hard. Because the Constitution Gardens represents one of the great triumphs in Washington or in any Capital city. And when you think of the blight there for many years in the so-called temporary buildings that block that beautiful sight, site when you think of the design that one Administration, one of three Presidents who appointed me, for example, to this Commission was very interested in, ~~was to put~~ putting a Tivoli, an amusement park, on that site, I think it is to the Commission's lasting honor that ~~what~~ when it was brought, ~~and~~ it was rejected; wiser heads prevailed, and a beautiful design took place because that is sacred soil, that is right next to our dearest and greatest patriotic memorials. And to put anything there is about the highest honor that this country can ~~have~~ bestow. I think none of us should lose sight as we go into the question of refinement of this or that design, ~~and~~ that simply being on the Mall at that site is an extraordinary statement of this country's pride in the people who are being memorialized there.

The current design takes advantage of the patriotism,

in that inherent in ~~that location~~ are two arms that point precisely to these two great memorials to Washington and to Lincoln.

So that when we deliberate about anything on that site, I think we do so with a very special sense of reference and of the sense of the long time frame. We get caught up in dedications, deadlines and conventions, meetings, excitement and public relations. And what we have to think of is what is going to ~~be the~~ benefit ~~to~~ all Americans over all time. These are big decisions, these monuments will be there long after all of us are dead, and we want our descendants to go there and have the same kind of pride in what was achieved there that we can have about our forebearers who built the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

So the question comes down to, first of all, the elements which have been now brought to us to add to the design as approved and to their location. We have indicated in an official letter to the Secretary of the Interior of last March 9th, that we felt the addition of such elements is possible in such a way as to be approved by this Commission. This was not an easy decision to make. It would have been far easier for this Commission at that point to say that since the addition of anything would change the original competition and

results that came from ~~that~~ it, that we will disapprove them without looking at a single submission. We would have been great heroes in some quarters for doing that, but I think in practical terms we would not have a monument, a memorial there as we now can see it. And I think that for the country's long-term benefit ~~a~~ the memorial that has almost been finished on that site is one that will do us all credit.

The question then comes of the specifics. One of the areas that we specifically have been asked to comment on for the first time today is the question of a locator for names. This is something that we have urged the proposers to bring to ~~our attention~~ us in specific form because the whole concept of the memorial, which is so moving, of listing the names in the order in which they fell, has one inherent practical problem which is that the grieving who want to track down a specific name may not have the luck that we heard about here earlier this afternoon of being able to find it rather quickly. And a locator becomes essential. We question whether one ~~telephone book~~ directory is enough, and we question the design of a sheet metal tube that, in our view, does not share the dignity, the sense of permanence ~~in terms~~ that a memorial should have. And we question furthermore the location which is so ~~unaccess~~ on axis with the arm of the memorial that it becomes almost a little

exclamation point at the end, it becomes somehow integrated ~~in design terms~~ design of the into the memorial. And I am sure that was not the intention that one should think of it as part of the design expression of ~~a~~ the memorial. So we urge a different location, one, however, in that vicinity so that it will be ~~handy~~ accessible to the handicapped; so that ~~there~~ they will ~~be~~ have free access to the ~~vehicular and part of the~~ experience of the memorial. Because no matter how much one relishes the degree in which this memorial has a free form openness which allows people to come upon it from various directions, there is no question but it will over time begin to be perceived as having a front door. That is only human nature. And that front door presumably will be from the side of the great memorial nearest to it, namely the Lincoln Memorial which has an enormous visitation to it every year. People will flow down those steps, they will go over to the Vietnam Memorial, and they will probably come to it from tourmobiles in that direction. That will be the ~~first~~ primary direction. The entrance experience into the memorial presents, and I remind you, as the amount of testimony this afternoon, that Congress indicated that the site for this memorial is the entire area bounded by those ~~walls~~ walks except for the easternmost part where there is an arbitrary line. It is a large area. Part of the memorial will be the trees

themselves. The experience of the sky, of nature and of the view of the other great monuments that one sees from ~~that site wherever one is on it~~ point within the site, one is in the hallowed ground dedicated by the will of the United States to lasting ~~and~~ honor to all those who served in Vietnam.

So we come then to the other two elements, the flagpole and the sculpture. And I now want to put on the table what I perceive in conversations with my colleagues here to be the consensus of what we all agree to be our recommendation, and then we will open the table to any dissent or see if this might be put in a motion form so that we have a decision for ~~you all~~ all of you today.

The flagpole is a wonderful thing to add to this memorial. I think that it is very fitting that this memorial, in particular, have the American flag. I believe it is a dangerous precedent, and this Commission would look very hard at the proliferation of flagpoles everywhere throughout the Mall. There is a ring of them around the Washington Monument. That is the focus for the whole Mall composition. ~~It~~ There is a very beautiful monument to the signers of the Declaration, and to put a flagpole there would be, in our view, totally inappropriate. But a flagpole, I think, is appropriate here if we can find the right ~~direction~~ location for it. The general height of 50

feet seems good to us. The design of the base ~~that is designed~~ with ~~that~~ an inscription is totally appropriate.

The sculpture, again, we approve in principle. We like the maquette as far as we can tell, as far as it goes, because we are experienced enough in sculpture to know that at final scale there are subtle changes that happen, and we naturally will have to reserve the right of final approval until we see the final maquette. But I think it does many of the things which the testimony revealed today. It strikes a chord of recognition in those who care most deeply about their experience there, and we find it acceptable.

The location of it and the flagpole and the locator are problems with the submission in its present form. The problems that I think are inherent in achieving the goals which have been so eloquently stated by the proposers, which is that if the sculpture is allowed to shiver naked out there in the field, to be an episodic element that is not integrated, that somehow relates to a flagpole which is so far away and whose height and silhouette will be cut off as one approaches the existing memorial, cut off at the knees as it were, that they will not combine to have the critical mass and impact which those elements deserve ~~for the honor of~~ to honor truly those who are ~~being honored~~ served. And, therefore, our recommendation would be

that these three elements which threaten to be episodic and disjointed be brought together to help enhance the entrance experience to the memorial, be put up front, as it were, to be put out there so that they are in the foreground and so that people will have a chance to recognize them and derive all the benefits from them as they enter into the precinct. The advantage of doing this not only serves the elements as they have been proposed, but it also accomplishes a goal which was a stated goal of the most recent sculpture commission which was to honor and protect the integrity of the original design. There we come to a crunch issue which is an area in which this Commission is specifically qualified to comment because this is about the artistic integrity of the design that has been submitted, ~~to it.~~

I refer you only to what would happen if today in the testimony people had been in the middle of a sentence and allowed to be interrupted by someone with an opposing view, what would happen if, as some of the people brought out, ~~if~~ the Washington Monument were suddenly to have a great bronze sculpture of George crossing the Delaware or sitting at home and surrounded by the children? What would happen, as one of the people who wrote in said, if the eternal flame over the Kennedy grave were to have the added embellishment of a

rocking chair? I think that what one has to recognize is that when one goes to a concert, one allows the full power of a single piece to operate and then there is nothing that says that within the framework of that concert there cannot be another selection, another piece, and that they can relate to each other by key or mood or purpose, or any one of a hundred different ways; but that it is not fair to interrupt Leontyne Price singing the Star Spangled Banner by a little section of country and western just because somebody wants to make sure that everyone in the audience will be pleased. It will not work. The audience will not be pleased. And I think when the morning after comes and all the discussion of compromise that has gone into this discussion ~~as are~~ is behind us, that as the years wear on, all of us ~~would~~ will feel somehow that we have been compromised by a design in which the integrity of its elements were not allowed to speak by and for themselves.

Is this something in which we can -- agree?

MR. NETSCH: There is no question on my part that we have concurrence with your statement.

We may feel that, as the proper site is developed, that there may be changes which we would be willing to receive in, say, the character of the sculpture, but that we would have to await another submission.

MR. NOVAK: I think we should make a motion.

MR. NETSCH: Yes, I think a motion. So moved, that the statements of the Chairman be given as the statements of the Commission.

MR. STONE: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So moved.

I know it is late, people want to leave.

VOICE: We didn't hear anything except what you said, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I am sorry, I didn't realize that I wasn't speaking into this.

The motion was that the statements of the Chairman be adopted as the statements of the full Commission, and it was moved and seconded and unanimously voted.

VOICE: What do the statements of the Chairman mean? You can take them either way.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The statements, I think, are as I tried to say in English, The sculpture is approved, the idea of the flagpole is approved, the current design of the

MR. NOVAK: I didn't we begin part I meti

MR. DENTON: Yes, I call a motion. So moved, t

the statements of the Chairman as the [illegible]

th[illegible] Commission.

MR. STONE: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So moved.

I know it is late, [illegible] very [illegible] to leave

VOICE: We didn't hear anything about what you

MR. CHAIRMAN:

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I am sorry. I didn't realize [illegible]

I wasn't speaking [illegible]

The motion was that the statements [illegible] the Chairm

be adopted as the statements of the [Hill Commission], and t

was moved and seconded and unanimously voted.

VOICE: What to the statements of the Chairman

ion can take them either way.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The statements, I think, were ma

tried to say is English. The sculpture is approved, the f

of the flagpole is approved, and ultimate design of the

locator is disapproved, and the location of all three is disapproved.

Then we would like to work with you, if possible, with all due speed, if you want to come to us with other options, or work towards a design that we think could be approved ~~improved~~ by the Commission.

MR. NOVAK: Which would be a cluster of the three elements in the area of the entranceway.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Is that mike on?

MR. NETSCH: No, they are not on.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Which would be, as Mr. Novak said, a cluster of the three elements in the area of the entranceway to the western part of the memorial site. There is a very beautiful natural entrance area there which is defined by some beautiful old oaks and which seems to us to be the most logical place to put them there. The exact location would have to be worked out in conjunction with you all.

MR. NETSCH: Mr. Chairman, we are also, I believe, perfectly willing to have a special session if there is action that would, you know, be receptive, that would lead to an approval prior to November 12, if such procedures do work out.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We do have a scheduled meeting

location is disadvantaged and the location of all three is approved.

Then we would like to work with Don of coastal with all due speed. If you want to come to me with other options, or work towards a design that we think could be improved by the commission.

MR. WOLKE: Which would be a cluster of the three elements in the area of the entranceway.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Is that mile out?

MR. WOLKE: One they are not or.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's would be as Mr. Brush re a study of the three elements in the area of the entrance to the western part of the memorial edge. There is a very beautiful natural entrance area there which is lacking by beautiful old oaks and that's seem to me to be the most ic oal place to put them there. The exact location would par be worked out in conjunction with you all

MR. WOLKE: Mr. Chairman, we are also perfectly willing to have a special meeting if that is action that would, you know, be effective, that could take an approval prior to November 15, if such presentation is not.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We do have a scheduled meeting

before the 11th, and if we can work quickly toward an agreement, we might even do it without having to bring everyone here. But at least we don't want to hold you up. That is our idea.

Well, thank you very much for your patience.

VOICE: This is a disapproval upon a new location? Not a disapproval of -- how can I phrase this properly -- what I am saying is -- you are concurring in what I am saying?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Pending working out the details of the location.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 5:30 p.m., the hearing was concluded.]

- - -

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT E-2

October 27, 1982

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I thought it might be useful to confirm the Commission's action October 13, 1982 on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and at the same time report on my meeting on the 22nd with representatives and consultants of the Memorial Fund and your office.

I believe we all felt our first get-together since the formal hearing on the 13th was most useful. We reviewed our position of having given conditional approval to the sculpture and flag, with the location of those elements and the name locator subject to further study. We believe that all three elements should be grouped near the southwest end of the memorial; the exact relationship remains to be determined.

For the purposes of the dedication, a flag or group of flags could be erected as part of the ceremonial structures, e.g. stands, lecterns or speakers platforms, and we concur that it may not be necessary to pin down the permanent location of the flag prior to the Veterans' Day ceremonies.

No date has been set for our next meeting, but I indicated I would be glad to meet as soon as the Memorial Fund consultants come up with some specific studies. I believe we are very close to a solution and look forward to hearing from them soon.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
James G. Watt
Secretary
Department of the Interior
18th & C Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20240